

J. Lowell 1785

AN
EXPLICATION
• OF THE
CATECHISM
OF THE
CHURCH of ENGLAND.

PART III.

Containing An
EXPLICATION
OF THE
LORDS PRAYER,
WITH
An INTRODUCTION, and APPENDIX to it.

By GABRIEL TOWERSON, D.D. sometime Fellow of
All-Souls Colledge in Oxford, and now Rector of Welwynne in
Hartfordshire.

The Second Edition Corrected.

Tertull. De Oratione Cap. 9.

Compendiis paucorum verborum, quot attinguntur edicta Prophetarum, Evangeliorum, Apostolorum, sermonis Domini, parabole, exempla, precepta? quot simul expunguntur officia? Dei honor in patre, fidei testimonium in nomine, oblatio obsequii in voluntate, commemoratio spei in regno, petitio vite in pane, exomologesis debitorum in deprecatione, sollicitudo tentationum in postulatione iustitie. Quid mirum? Deus solus docere potuit, ut se vellet orari.

LONDON,

Printed by F. Leach, for Ric. Chiswell, Tho. Sawbridge, Ric. Bantly,
and Geo. Wells. MDC LXXXV.

NOTATION

OF THE

MEMBER

OF THE

MEMBER

NOTATION

OF THE

NOTATION

OF THE

NOTATION

OF THE

NOTATION

NOTATION

NOTATION

NOTATION

NOTATION

NOTATION

NOTATION

NOTATION

NOTATION

Charles Laue

TO THE
MOST REVEREND
FATHER ⁱⁿ GOD
WILLIAM

BY

Divine Providence

LORD ARCHBISHOP
OF
CANTERBURY,

Primate of all *ENGLAND* and Metropolitan,
And one of His Majesties most Honourable
PRIVY-COUNCIL, &c.

May it please Your Grace,

HAVING already made some considerable progress in an Explication of our Church Catechism, and published two parts of it; I was resolved to lay aside that subject for a while, and to proceed no farther till I had given both my self and my Reader some respite. But, contrary to that Resolution I found my self obliged to make more than ordinary hast with this third Part; that I might leave some publick testimony of my gratitude for the Favour your Grace has been pleased since to confer upon me, which as I could no way deserve, so I had no other way to acknowledge.

The

The EPISTLE

The Argument I here present your Grace with, is indeed worthy of a better Pen ; if it were only for the usefulness thereof toward the composing of those Controversies, which have now, for many years, torn in pieces the Church of England. For since the main of our Domestick differences have been concerning Prayer, about which if we could once agree, our Unanimity in this, and God's Blessing upon it might help to silence, or compose the rest ; From whence could we more reasonably hope an effectual determination of them, than from That Prayer which is now before us, and which, as it hath Him for its Author, whom we all profess to revere, so was intended, in the opinion of all men, to give Law to ours?

But because either the inclinations, or engagements of Learned Men have led them another way, and prompted them to different subjects, or at least to take another course for the clearing of this ; It will not, I hope, be displeasing to your Grace, if for that reason, as well as to assist men in their Devotions, I present them with an Explication of the Lords Prayer, and implore Your Graces Patronage thereof.

Of my performances therein, I will not trouble Your Grace with an Account, partly because the work it self will declare what they are, and partly because I am not so confident of them myself, as to promise my self Your Graces approbation of them. I humbly take leave only to assure Your Grace, that as I have endeavoured upon all occasions to do right to the Church of England, and so requite her, in the best manner I could, for that instruction which I have received

DEDICATORY.

received from her; so I have, with equal, or greater diligence, endeavoured to find out the sense of the present Prayer, and render it intelligible to others: That so men may not only bring with them a due understanding of, and suitable affections to it, but be thereby able to form such other legitimate Petitions, as may be agreeable to their particular concerns. If I have, as I hope I have in some measure, attain'd either the one or the other, I shall be abundantly satisfy'd with what I have done, and so much the rather, because I shall thereby also be assur'd of Your Grace's favourable construction of it, which is the only farther ambition of

YOUR GRACE'S

In all bounden Duty

and Service,

GABRIEL TOWERSON.

AN

Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the matter of the
of the same, and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.
I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
G. J. Johnson

Small business Day

and service

G. J. Johnson

AN
INTRODUCTION
TO THE
EXPLICATION
OF THE
LORDS PRAYER,
As that is a part of, and Interpreted by
THE
CATECHISM
OF THE
CHURCH of ENGLAND.

Where, agreeably to the Doctrine of the Catechism, and the nature of the Argument, an Account is given, in so many set Discourses,

1. *Of mens inability to keep the Commandments of God without his special Grace, and the necessity of Prayer thereupon.*
2. *Of the nature of Prayer in the General, and*
3. *Of the Lord's Prayer in particular.*

AN
INTRODUCTION
TO THE
EXPLICATION
OF THE
LORDS PRAYER

As this is a part of, and inserted by

THE
CATECHISM
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Where, agreeably to the Doctrine of the Cate-
chism, and the nature of the Argument, an
Account is given, in so many for Discourses,
1. Of mens inability to keep the Command-
ments of God without his special Grace,
and the necessity of Prayer thereupon.
2. Of the nature of Prayer in the General, and
3. Of the Lords Prayer in particular.

THE
CATECHISM
OF THE
CHURCH
OF
ENGLAND.

PART III.

Catechist.

MY good Child, know this, that thou art not able to do these things of thy self, nor to walk in the Commandments of God, and to serve him, without his special Grace, which thou must learn at all times to call for by diligent Prayer. Let me hear therefore if thou canst say the Lords Prayer.

Answer.

Our Father which art in Heaven, Hallowed by thy Name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done in Earth, as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily Bread, And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, But deliver us from evil. Amen.

Question.

What desirest thou of God in this Prayer?

Answer.

I desire my Lord God our Heavenly Father who is the giver of all goodness, to send his grace unto me, and to all people, that we may worship him, serve him, and obey him as we ought to do. And I pray unto God, that he will send us all things that be needful both for our Souls and Bodies, and that

that he will be merciful unto us, and forgive us our sins; and that it will please him to save and defend us in all dangers Ghostly and Bodily; and that he will keep us from all sin and wickedness, and from our Ghostly Enemy, and from everlasting death. And this I trust he will do of his mercy and goodness, through our Lord Jesus Christ. And therefore I say, Amen. So be it.

OF THE CHURCH

OF

ENGLAND

PART III.

Answer

Most good Child, know this, that thou art not able to do these things of thyself, nor to walk in the Commandments of God, and to leave him without his special Grace, which thou must learn at all times to call for by diligent Prayer. For we hear therefore it thou canst say the Lords Prayer.

Answer

Our Father which art in Heaven, hallowed be thy Name. Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done in Earth, as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily Bread, and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.

Question

What dost thou of God in this Prayer?

Answer

I desire my Lord God our Heavenly Father who is the giver of all good gifts, to send his Grace with me, and to all people, that we may worship him in pure heart, and obey him as we ought to do. And I pray unto God, that he will send us all things that be needful both for our Souls and Bodies, and that

I

AN
INTRODUCTION
TO THE
EXPLICATION
OF THE
LORDS PRAYER,

DISCOURSE I.

Of mens inability to keep the Commandments
of God without his SPECIAL GRACE, and
the necessity of P R A Y E R thereupon.

That inability, which the Catechism affirms, being asserted by it upon the sole account of mens destitution of Gods special grace, supposeth it to believe that they have or may have an ability otherwise; and enquiry thereupon made, whether we have or may have an ability to keep the Commandments of God from whence it is, and by what means it may be obtain'd. How far the Heathen went as to the acknowledging of that Ability to proceed from God, and what Christianity superaddeth to their doctrine or belief.

Supposing now, as I hope I may, that men have been satisfied as to the sense, and convinced both of the reasonableness and the obligation of those Commandments, which were the Argument of the foregoing Explication; it remains that we enquire whether we have or may have an Ability for the keeping of them; from whence that Ability is; and by what means it may be obtain'd. For as it would be but a sad consideration to know our selves to be under those Commandments, which we have not an Ability to answer; so that Catechism, which I have chosen to explain, supposeth that we have, or may have such an Ability, but which withal must be derived to us from the special grace of God, as that again by diligent prayer be called for. With these enquiries therefore it will be but necessary to begin this Third Part of my Explication, and so at once compleat my discourse concerning the Commandments of God, and prepare the way to that which professeth to entreat of Prayer, and of that particular one, which was intended as an Exemplar of it.

Catechist.
My good child,
know this, that
thou art not a-
ble to do these
things of thy self,
nor to walk in
the command-
ments of God,
and so serve
him, without his
special grace,
which thou must
learn at all times
to call for by di-
ligent Prayer.
Let me hear
therefore if thou
canst say the
Lords Prayer.

B

These

2 Of mens inability to keep the Commandments of God,

^a Explicat. of the Doctrine of the Sacraments and particularly of that of Bapt.

^b Explicat. of the Apostles Creed. Article of the forgiveness of Sins.

These two things only would be premis'd concerning that keeping of God's Commandments, after our Ability for which we are now enquiring; *first*, that I intend not thereby any compleat and absolute one, but only such a keeping of them, as I shall afterwards shew Christianity to enjoin upon us; as *secondly*, that I much less intend the keeping of that or this particular Commandment, or indeed of any or all of them as to the external duties thereof alone. For as I have elsewhere made it appear, that we are not to expect any such Ability, as may preserve us from all transgressions of them, so I no way doubt men may, without God's *special grace*, yield obedience to some of his Commandments, and, it may be too, an external compliance with them all: Because the Heathen, without any other than the common assistances of the divine grace, went a great way toward the keeping of them; and there is besides so much of reasonableness in the matter of those Commandments, as may prompt a considerate man, who hath also a clear understanding of them, to yield an outward conformity to them all. When therefore I enquire concerning an Ability for the keeping of them, my meaning is of such a keeping of them as Christianity enjoins upon us, and which, though it be not so intire as strict justice may be thought to require, yet is hearty and uniform, and in fine such as our own Church hath represented it to be in that interpretation which it hath before given of them.

I. Now that we have or may have an Ability so to keep the Commandments of God, that is to say, so far as Christianity binds them on us, that very obligation which it lays upon us, will satisfie any reasonable man. For however we may be oblig'd by the *first Covenant* to keep the Commandments of God, even after we cease to have an Ability for the keeping of them; partly, because we sometime had an Ability for the keeping of them, but which we forfeited through our own default; and partly, because that Covenant proceeds with us by the measures of justice, which may continue to oblige in respect of that Ability we sometime had: Yet the like is not to be suppos'd concerning that *second and better Covenant* which Christianity makes a tender of; this, as it considers us, not as we sometimes were, but as we now are, so professing to proceed with us by the measures of mercy, and which, as such will always have a regard to the present temper of those whom it makes the objects of its kindness, otherwile it must necessarily fail of accomplishing its intended kindness, which Mercy, as such, cannot be suppos'd to be negligent of. If therefore that *second Covenant* do yet oblige us to the keeping of the Commandments of God, as the whole tenour thereof doth sufficiently declare; either it will oblige us no farther to the keeping of them, than that state, in which it finds us, doth of it self enable us for; or, if it oblige us any farther, as no doubt it doth, it will furnish us with such an ability, as may qualifie us for the keeping of them. But so that very Covenant doth declare it self to intend, as we learn both from the Prophet *Jeremy* and the *Author to the Hebrews* d, the purport thereof being that God would put his laws in our inward parts or minds, and write them in our hearts, as well as not remember our past iniquities any more.

^c Jer. 31. 33.
^d Heb. 8. 10.

II. Now as when it appears that either we have or may have an Ability for keeping God's Commandments, it will be but reasonable to enquire from whence that Ability is; so we shall find meer *Naturalists* so far concurring

concurring with us, as to acknowledge that Ability to be in some measure from God: because first acknowledging it to be originally from God, as all other the powers and faculties of men are. For thus even those men did, who plac'd it in the natural liberty of mens wills, yea even when they made it unnecessary to look beyond that for the doing of their duty. For the Gods, saith Marcus Antoninus, have

put it into the power of every man not to fall into those evils which are really such, that is to say, into vitious ones. And the journey, saith Seneca, to that which is the chiefest good is safe and pleasant, and for which nature hath furnished thee. She hath given thee these things, which if thou dost not forsake, thou shalt rise to an equality with God. It must be granted secondly, that what force soever they gave to the natural liberty of the will, yet they did not only acknowledge the receiving of it from God, but the necessity of the divine concurrence with it toward the exerting of its natural force: Partly, because amidst the great brags of their own Self-sufficiency, both advising others and imploring themselves

from the divine Powers a sound mind as well as a sound body; and partly because of their acknowledging the superintendency of the Divine providence, and the necessity of its sustaining those things which his hands had made. For he that acknowledgeth such a sustentation as to other beings and operations, can much less think it unnecessary as to the upholding of the noblest ones, and those faculties which are most considerable in them.

And to this I suppose Marcus Antoninus might allude, where he adviseth the praying unto God to give us a freedom from fearing, or desiring, or being grieved at any external things. For if

saith he *b*, the Gods do cooperate with men in all other things, they may cooperate with them as to these also. And a little after, to one that objected against such Prayers, that God had put all these things into our own power, according to the doctrine of the Stoicks, Who told you, saith he *i*, that the Gods do not

help with us, even as to those things which they have put into our own power? It must be granted thirdly, at least as to some of the most sober of them, that they did also acknowledge to God his preserving them from evil by taking away the temptations to it, or inclining them to

good by certain suggestions and admonitions, whether ministered to them by internal inspirations, or by the good examples of others. For

thus on the one hand the foresaid Marcus Antoninus acknowledgeth it to the kindness of the Gods *k*, that how inclinable soever he was to rebel against his superiours, yet he had been hindered by them from it, as by whose

beneficence it was, that he had not had a favourable opportunity for it; as on the other hand, that he was incited to vertue by the good ex-

ample as well as precepts of Apollonius I, and Rusticus, and Maximus, and by more intimate and immediate suggestions from the Gods them-

selves. *Διὸς ἐνταῦθα τὸ μετὰ τὴν συνθεσιν περὶ τὸν Ζηνὶ, ὅτι ἐμὲ μὲν ἐλάττωσεν. ἢ ἄλλοι Ἀπολλώνιον, Ρέστηρον, Μαξιμόν. vid. & lect. 7. 8. 15. ejusdem libri. ἢ ἴβιδ. ὅτε, ὅσον ἐπὶ τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ ταῖς ἐνθεοῖς διδασκαλίαις, καὶ συλλήψεσιν. καὶ ὁμοίαις, μὴ δὲν καλεῖν ἢ καὶ χεῖρ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, ἢ ἀπολείπειν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αἰτίαν, καὶ περὶ τὸ μὴ διατρέχειν τὰς ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἀνομιὰς, καὶ μονοεχὶ διδασκαλίαις.*

*Ἄλλα καὶ εἰς τὴν μέγα αὐτοῖς
τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ
ἐλάττωσεν κακῶς ἵνα μὴ περι-
πίπτῃ ὁ ἀνθρώπος, ἐν αὐτοῖς
τὸ ὅταν ἐθύντο καὶ εἰς ἑαυτοὺς,
li. 2. sect. 11.*

*f Senec. Ep. 31. Hoc est sum-
mum bonum, quod si occupas, inci-
pis Deorum esse socius, non supplex.
Quomodo, inquis, isto pervenitur?
Tutum iter est, jucundum est, ad
quod natura te instruxit. Pedit
tibi illa, quia si non deserueris, par
Deo surges.*

*g Orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano.
Fortem posce animum, et moris terrore caventem
Qui spiritum vitæ extremum inter munera ponat
Natura, qui ferre queat quoscunque dolores
Nesciat irasci, cupiat nihil, et potiores
Herculis æumnas credat, servosque labores
Et Venere, et cœnâ, et plumis Sardanapali.
Monstro quod ipse tibi possis dare —*

Juven. Satyr. 101

*h Marc. Ant on. li. 9. sect. 40.
πῶς οὐδ' εἰ θνητοὶ συνε-
στῇν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ εἰς ταῦτα
θνητοὶ συνεστῇν.*

*i M. Ant. ubi supra. ἀλλὰ ἴ-
σως ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἐπ' αὐτοῖς αὐτὰ οἱ
θεοὶ ἐπέβησαν — τίς δὲ σὺν αὐ-
τοῖς, ὅτι ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ αἱ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς
οἱ θεοὶ συλλαμβάνουσιν;*

k Lib. 1. Sect.

17. καὶ ὅτι πῶς

ἐν τῇ αὐτῶν

περὶ τῶν

ἐλλειψάσθαι

τι καὶ οἱ θεοὶ

*ἐβίβαν ἰχθυό-
αυτων, αὐτοῖς, καὶ*

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

ἐβίβαν, καὶ

4 Of mens inability to keep the Commandments of God, &c.

selves. For these and other such like things he acknowledged to *require* the assistance of the Gods n and fortune, and that it was unto them that he himself owed them. Thus far therefore even the *Stoicks* went toward the acknowledgment of the divine assistance, that as they attributed that liberty of will, by which they supposed all good things to be done, to the gift of the divine powers; so they believ'd the same divine powers, to concur to the conversation of it, and not seldom also to assist both it and them by averting temptations from them, or ministering to them such suggestions, or good examples, as inclin'd them the more to good. But as it is evident from the *admonition* I am now upon, that something more is intended than all those concessions will amount unto, because suggesting the necessity of Gods *special grace* which none of the benefits before remembered are; so it is yet more evident from the declaration

o Art. 10. Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ, preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

p Phil. 2. 13

q Explicat. of the Creed. Art. of the Holy Ghost.

r Explicat. of the Doctrine of the Sacraments.

f Luk. 11. 9. t — 13.

the Church elsewhere o makes of the nature of that *grace* which is here inculcated: As which is affirmed to consist in the right disposing of the will, and either begetting in it those good inclinations which it hath, or cooperating with it. Agreeably herein, as in all other things, to the doctrine of the Scripture, as which affirmeth p God to work in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure. And indeed as that is a truth which cannot well be doubt-

ed of, after what I have before q shewn concerning the necessity of the *Holy Ghost's* concurrence to the beginning, progress, and perfection of all our holiness, so it will become yet more clear by the account I shall afterwards r give of that depravation, which our nature receiv'd by the fall of our first Parents: There being but need of an *especial grace* there, where the whole man was so signally deprav'd.

III. I will conclude this discourse, when I have added, That the Grace, whereof we speak, being the Grace of God, and so in his power to confer, in what measure, or upon what terms he himself pleaseth; we are consequently to believe it cannot be attain'd by any other means, than he shall be pleased to appoint. The result of which observation will be the necessity of seeking it by *diligent Prayer*, because prescribed to us by God as a means for the obtaining of any benefit f from him, and particularly of that *spirit* t from whence this grace and our own ability is immediately derived to us. As for the *natural grounds* of seeking unto God by *Prayer* for this or any other boon, they will fall in more pertinently in my discourse concerning *Prayer*, and to which therefore I shall reserve the investigation of them.

DISCOURSE II. OF PRAYER.

What it is, and what are the grounds of making of it. What particular duties it contains, and what are the several species or kinds thereof. When, and after what manner it ought to be perform'd, and of how signal efficacy it is when it is performed as it ought.

A *Doraturi sedeant*, let those who are about to worship sit down, it is one of the *Symbols* of *Pythagoras*, and may seem to contain an easie and acceptable advice; as if in the doing of our Devotions we were to consult our own ease, and worship God with as little trouble as may be to our selves. But as all such kind of sentences, like the Egyptian *Hieroglyphicks*, have a sense extreamly different from what they may seem at the first sight to import; so this in particular, if we may believe a learned man *a*, denotes that consideration and advice, which ought to be used by us, when we set our selves to any religious action. For as the mind of man, in the opinion of the Philosopher, becomes more sedate and compos'd whilst the body is at ease and untroubled; so it is not unutil, even in the Scripture, by this posture of body to express that mature deliberation, which we ought to enter into, when we go about any important business. Thus when our Saviour would instruct his Disciples with what advice the men of the world go about any action of concernment, and proportionably thereunto, with what deliberation we our selves ought to enter upon the profession of Christianity, he expresseth it after this manner; *Which of you b intending to build a Tower sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost whether he have sufficient to finish it? and again c, What King going to War with another King sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand?* Of so great necessity is it, if we may judge ought by the practice of the world, to sit down and consider before we enterprize any matter of importance; so alike necessary is it, if we may believe *Pythagoras*, to use the same deliberation and advice before we betake our selves to the doing of our Devotions: Though to leave as little as may be, to after thoughts, I will once for all, set my self to shew *what that is* to which so great a deliberation is prerequir'd, and *what the grounds of making it are*; *what particular duties it contains*, and *what the several species thereof are*; in fine, *when and after what manner it ought to be perform'd*, and *of how signal efficacy it is, when it is performed as it ought.*

a Lilius Gyraldus in Interpretat. Symb. Pythag.

b Luk. 14. 28.
c ——— 31.

I. Now Prayer is nothing else than an *Application* of the Soul to God, with a design of representing to him its desires of obtaining from him those benefits which we want, or the pleasing sense it hath of those benefits we have already receiv'd. I call it first, an *Application* of the Soul, because Prayer is principally performed there, and requires not the assistance of the tongue, otherwise, than as being enjoyned by God, as a farther instance of our subjection to him, or as it may be necessary to manifest those

those affections of ours to others, and with whose Prayers we are upon occasion to joyn our own. For he, who wants a tongue, or doth not make use of it, may beg a benefit as truly, or acknowledge a benefit as gratefully, as he who either hath a tongue, or makes use of it. I call it secondly, an appliacion of the Soul to God, to distinguish it from those requests which are at any time made to men; and indeed because such an application of the Soul cannot be made to any other than God: No other than he, who is the searcher of hearts, being privy to its affections, or to those representations which it makes of them by its own single act. In fine, I call it an application of the Soul to God with a design of representing to him, or, setting before him, its desires of obtaining from him those benefits which we want, or its pleasing sense of those we have already receiv'd. And this I do, partly upon the account of that representation whereof I speak, and partly upon the account of those desires, and pleasing sense, which I have said to be the object of it. For first of all beside those desires, and that pleasing sense, which I have said it doth involve; it doth moreover manifestly denote an ordination or address of them to God, yea that ordination and address is indeed the very formality thereof. For Prayer, as such, importing the referring it self to another, even to him to whom it is made, till that, which is the object of it, comes to be so referr'd, it cannot have any thing of the nature of it, and doth indeed only denote the simple affection of the Soul as to those benefits which it either hath or wants, and which, at the best, is but a natural one. All therefore we have to account for as to the former definition of Prayer, is its representing as well the pleasing sense the Soul hath of benefits receiv'd, as its desires of those we are without. A thing not to be doubted of, if we consider either that sense which *custome* the master of language hath impos'd upon it, or what that is wherein we have said the very formality of Prayer doth consist. For as however Prayer, in its strictest notion, refers only to our desires, yet it is by the custom of the world extended as well to the signification of that pleasing sense we have of benefits receiv'd; so that signification hath this in common with the signification of our desires, that it is alike directed and address'd unto God, and hath him for the object of it. And more than this I will not say at present concerning the general nature of Prayer, because what is farther observable concerning it, will fall in pertinently enough, when I come to declare the grounds of the making of it, the particular duties it contains or the manner after which it ought to be perform'd.

II. For the clearing of the *first* whereof, and together therewith the nature of that duty I am now upon, I think it not amiss to shew, first, what is not to be look'd upon as the ground of the performance of it, and then what really is. I said but now in that account which I gave of the nature of Prayer, that we were to look upon it as such an application of the Soul to God, as is made with a design of representing to him its desires of obtaining from him those benefits which we want, or the pleasing sense it hath of those we have already receiv'd. But because even that representation is not without a farther end (for men represent not their desires to God, or any other, meerly for that representation it self) and because there is appearance enough of their making it oftentimes for very ill ends, and such as the nature of God will by no means allow of; Therefore I shall caution men in the first place

place against the representing their either desires of new benefits, or pleasing sense of ancient ones, out of an opinion of giving God a more exact information concerning them. For not to say that that can be no proper ground of Prayer, because (as our Saviour *d* tells us) God *knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him*, to pray to God with such an opinion; is rather to defame than honour him, because derogatory to that infinite knowledge wherewith he is indu'd. I think myself no less obliged, secondly, to caution men against making such representations, out of an opinion of disposing God thereby to that mercifulness which he hath not, or wearying him into the granting of their requests. For though this may be oftentimes the ground of those requests we make to men, because either wholly devoid of that charity which becomes them, or having it in so languid a manner as to need a spur to the exciting of it: Yet we have so great proofs of the tenderness of the divine goodness, that we cannot think it to be a just ground of begging any thing from him, or acknowledging to him what we have. If that representation whereof we speak be not without its grounds, it must have other, and more rational ones; and which I conceive to be the acknowledgment of our dependance upon God, or the benefit that may thereby accrue unto our selves. For neither can any man think it other than reasonable to acknowledge his dependance upon him who is the preserver, as well as author of his being, nor, acknowledging it, but he must also beg of him those benefits which he wants, or profess to him his grateful sense of those which he already hath. For inasmuch as all men naturally desire the preservation of their being, inasmuch as that desire doth as naturally prompt them to sue to others for it, if they think not themselves able to effect it? they must consequently, if they believe it to come from God, seek to him for it, yea seek it by those ways and means which Prayer doth lead us to. Otherwise they do in effect renounce that dependance, which they have upon this the preserver of their being. Again, forasmuch as the knowledge of our dependance upon any person, doth as naturally lead us to profess to him our pleasing sense of those benefits we find our selves to have receiv'd; neither can we omit that acknowledgment of our dependance, without renouncing the thing it self, or indeed without renouncing our own reason and inward peace. In respect of God therefore Prayer hath for its ground the obligation we are under to acknowledge our dependance on him, and which cannot in any tolerable measure be acknowledged, but by such a declaration of it. But neither will it be found to be without ground, when considered with respect to our selves, if our own benefit and advantage may be thought a reasonable inducement to it. For it being not to be thought, on the one hand, that God will so far favour the irregularity of his dependants, as to confer benefits upon those who do not acknowledge themselves to be so; and it being as little to be thought, on the other, that he will so far forget his own goodness, or promises, as to deny his benefits to those who do thus acknowledge themselves to be so; Neither can we think but that, if we omit it, we shall fall short of those benefits, or, performing it, but that we shall certainly obtain them. Which will consequently make the prospect of our own benefit and advantage to be another and no less reasonable ground of Prayer, as without which we cannot hope to obtain it, nor fear the want thereof with it.

III. To

III. To go on now to shew what *particular duties* it contains, and which the definition of Prayer before given will help toward the discovery of; because assuring us that it contains in it the *begging* of God those benefits which we want, and the representing to him our own *pleasing sense* of those we have already received from him. Only, because even these will require a farther explication, and may, beside that, be drawn down to yet more particular instances, I will a little more nearly consider the nature both of the one and the other, and shew to what farther instances they extend.

I. To begin with that which hath in a more especial manner the name of Prayer, even the *begging* of God those benefits which we want, where again we will consider it as to the more general nature of it, and then as to those more particular duties into which it brancheth it self. In the general I observe concerning that part of Prayer which we are now upon, that it either implieth or containeth in it these five things. 1. Our own want of that which we pray for, and Gods ability to supply it. 2. Our acknowledgment both of the one and the other. 3. A desire of having that want supplied by him. 4. A representation of that our desire to God. 5. A hope at least of obtaining from him that supply. That that part of Prayer which we are now upon supposeth the *first* of these, even our own want of what we pray for, and Gods ability to supply it, cannot need any proof to him who considers only the importance of it. For neither would there be any need of Prayer, if we already had what we desir'd, neither would it be to any purpose to pray, if he, to whom we did so, were not of sufficient Ability to grant it. It will be as evident *secondly*, to him who shall take the pains to consider it, that as it doth suppose our want of what we pray for, and Gods ability to supply it, so it doth equally imply our acknowledgment of them both. For our very Prayer to God for the granting of any benefit, is in it self an acknowledgment thereof; because, arising from the sense we have of our own want of the benefit prayed for, and of the ability of him, we pray to, to supply it. For neither do our own wants stir us at all, but as they are apprehended and owned by us; neither is Gods ability of any more force with us, than as it is apprehended by our minds, and received by them into their belief. I know not whether I should any more than say, *thirdly*, that Prayer, properly so call'd, and in which sense we now take it, doth also imply a desire of having that want supplied by him. For every man, that is acquainted with his own thoughts, doth not only find that desire to be then in him, but finds that desire to be the thing, which immediately prompts him to apply himself to God, and sue to him for those benefits for which he prays. I shall therefore proceed to observe, *fourthly*, that the same Prayer contains in it a representation of that our desire to God; which is so true, that, as I have before shewn, it is the very formality thereof, it is that which gives perfection to our desires, and makes them of natural to become Religious ones. I may not omit to add, *fifthly*, that Prayer properly so call'd, doth also imply a hope at least of obtaining that for which we pray. For neither are mens desires at all stir'd, where there is no hope of compassing the object of them; and much less can we think they will be so far as to prompt the person, in whom they are, to represent them to anothers care and prudence. I say not the same at present concerning that

that *assurance* and *unshaken belief* wherewith Christianity enjoyns us to beg, what we do, of God: Partly, because that seems not to be any natural requisite of Prayer, but more especially because that will find a more proper place, when I come to enquire after what manner this so great and important a duty ought to be performed by us.

An account being thus given of the general nature of Prayer, or rather of that first part thereof, which is now under consideration; consider we it in the next place as to those more particular duties into which it brancheth it self, and which we shall find to be with regard to the *persons* for whom we pray, or with regard to those *benefits* which we ask. With respect to the former of these, it contains a double duty, proportionably to the persons which are to have a share in it; Because obliging us to pray first for our own welfare, and then for the welfare of others. From whence the obligation of the former of these is, needs not now to be said, because I have before sufficiently accounted for it: it remains therefore, that I give an account of the ground of the latter, which yet will not be difficult to do. For not now to say any thing of the commands of God in Scripture for it, because even those commands are not without natural grounds; We are obliged so to pray, *first*, upon the account of that, whether love or esteem, or gratitude which is owing by us to other men. Thus for instance, because we are to have a love for all men whatsoever, and, proportionably thereto, so far as in us lies, to procure their good; we are also, because *every good and perfect gift is from above*, to seek it thence for them, and implore Gods favour and beneficence. In like manner, because we are to have an esteem for all that are in Authority over us, and particularly, for our Parents, and Princes, and Masters; and because that esteem will as naturally lead us to desire their being considered and regarded by others, but especially by those who can add most to their dignity and honour; We are also, because God is the fountain of honour, to commend them to his regard, and pray him to take them into his special grace and favour. Lastly, forasmuch as we are under an obligation to be grateful to those from whom we receive any emolument; forasmuch as that gratefulness requires the making of a return, so far at least as the emolument receiv'd exacts, and our ability will bear; forasmuch, lastly, as some emoluments are above the possibility of any other return, as the benefits we receive from our Parents, or at least above any other ability of ours, as the benefits confer'd by great persons upon mean and indigent ones: We are consequently to make such persons the grateful return of our Prayers, and beg of God to supply to them our want of Ability out of the Treasures of his own infinite one. Only, if neither our duty, nor the consideration of a past advantage may be look'd upon as a sufficient obligation to pray for others; we have oftentimes for a *farther* ground of our so praying, our own emolument and advantage being so wrapp'd up with other mens, that it cannot be obtain'd but in, and by it. Which as it may therefore be a sufficient ground of praying for others, if our own emolument and advantage be so for the praying for our selves, so it must be concluded to be much more so, as to our praying for Kings, and all that are in Authority under them: It being impossible that Subjects should enjoy either peace or prosperity, if the other are afflicted, or ill at ease. Though if neither that *second* ground will satisfy altogether, because the ground

* Mat. 10. 42.

only of those prayers that are made for some particular persons, we have for a *third* and more general one, the turning even of those prayers to our account, which are made in the behalf of other men: Charity as it is not without the promise of a reward, even in the most trifling * instances thereof; so being not therefore likely to want it, when it exerts it self in Prayer, and which, where it is performed as it ought, is the greatest benefaction whatsoever.

I have consider'd Prayer hitherto with reference to the person for whom we pray, and shewn accordingly to what particular duties it obligeth us; I come now to consider it as to those *benefits* it pretends to beg, and the duties that are consequent thereupon; Though what those are, will then be more seasonably enquir'd, when I have the *Lord's Prayer* for my argument, because intended in an especial manner for our direction in them. In the general I observe, 1. That Prayer, considered under that notion, obligeth us to beg of God the granting of those things that are good or profitable for us, and the averting and delivering us from all hurtful ones; this having no less the nature of a benefit, than the conferring of those things that are good, and apprehended so to be, by those who have felt the smart of any evil. I observe, 2. As to the former of these; that, agreeable to our own wants, and the nature of the blessings desir'd, we are to beg of God, in the first place, those things which are good or profitable for our Souls, and particularly those which tend to perfect them in their apprehensions of, or assimilation unto God, which is their greatest honour and advantage. The consequent whereof will be the begging of him a due understanding of his word, where both his nature and our duty is described, a ready compliance of the will, with the intimations of that of God, and well plac'd and regular affections. Next to which we are to desire of God those things which are good or profitable for our bodies, both because a part of us, and because without the welfare of those our Souls cannot readily exercise their respective functions; But still as the order of the body in respect of the Soul admonisheth, with subordination to the welfare of our Souls, and those things which are perfective of them. The consequent whereof will be, the not desiring of those things which are profitable for our bodies; any farther, than they shall be found to be consistent with the welfare of the other. I observe, 3. As to our desiring of God the averting, or delivering us from all hurtful things, which is the second branch of my first division, that here also we are to beg in the first place the averting of those things which are hurtful to our souls, as all sinful inclinations or actions, and the several incentives of, or temptations to them, that wrath of God which is apt to be stirred up thereby; and that horreur and anguish of mind which naturally ariseth from them both, and shall be sure to be the guilty Soul's portion either in this world or in the next. The consequent whereof will be, the begging of his grace to purifie us from, and assist us against all sinful pollutions, the accepting of Christ's death and satisfaction in order to our reconciliation and pardon; and in fine, the conferring upon us the comforts of his Spirit for the calming and quieting of ours. But as when that is done, nothing hinders us to beg also the averting of those things which are hurtful to the body; so I know no other abatement of it, than the ministring of those hurtful things (as experience shews they often do) to our spiritual and eternal welfare.

In

In which case we ought to be so far from desiring the averting of them, that, on the contrary, we ought to think it all joy when they happen to us.

2. From that first great duty of Prayer, even the begging of those benefits we want, pass we to the second, that is to say, to the *thanking* God for benefits receiv'd; where again we will consider it as to the *general nature* of it, and then as to those more *particular duties* which it contains.

In the *general* I observe, agreeably to my former definition of it, that it either supposeth or implyeth in it these four things. 1. Our having receiv'd certain benefits from God. 2. The Souls pleasing sense of those benefits. 3. Its equal sense of the kindness of him from whom we receiv'd them. 4. and lastly, The representing that its sense to God. That the duty we are now upon, supposeth the first of these, is so clear to every man that consults his own thoughts, that it may suffice barely to represent it. For neither do men thank God, or any other, but for the receipt of something; nor yet but for the receipt of such things as either really are, or (which is all one) apprehended by them to be benefits. For if the thing in question be not receiv'd, it may perhaps stir our desires, but not our thanks, and, if it be, yet not our thanks unless it comes to us also under the notion of a benefit. For so, it will be either wholly unprofitable, which stirs us not at all; or pernicious, which will provoke us only to aversion and hatred. But neither is there less evidence of the duty we are now upon, implying the souls pleasing sense of those benefits we have receiv'd. For beside that assurance we have of it from our own inward thoughts, and to which, in things of this nature, we must necessarily appeal; if men, through the corruptness of their nature, or the expectation of greater benefits, happen to have no pleasing sense of that which they have obtain'd, they sit down fully under it, and are so far from thanking their benefactor for what they have, that they are ready, on the contrary, to reproach him for not proceeding farther in his beneficence. I shall therefore add, thirdly, as a more material, and no less clear observation, that this duty doth also imply the souls equal sense of the kindness of him from whom we have receiv'd the benefit. For beside that the sense we speak of, whilst it confines it self to the benefit receiv'd, is an affection purely natural, and cannot therefore come under the rank of Moral or Religious ones; if the person, who confer'd the benefit, either did not at all intend it, or did not intend it as such, we thank him not at all for it, and congratulate only our own good fortune in it. Which shews that it is the kindness of the person conferring it, which stirs our thankfulness, and not meerly, or only, the pleasing sense we have of the thing receiv'd. It remains to compleat the duty, that we also represent unto God, that pleasing sense we have of the benefit receiv'd, and of his kindness in it. For till it comes to be so represented it is rather Meditation than Prayer, but however, is but an *imperfect* acknowledgment of our dependance upon God, for which I have shewn this duty of Prayer to be requir'd: Because nature doth not only prompt us to have a grateful sense of benefits, but to represent that our sense to him from whom we receiv'd them, as a more clear and explicate acknowledgment thereof.

It appearing from the premises what the general nature of that duty

is, which is the subject of our present consideration, we shall not be long to seek, what more *particular* ones it leads us to. For we shall find it to lead, *first*, to thankfulness for benefits conferred on our selves, or for those which have been conferred on other men : For the former, as an acknowledgment of our own dependance upon God ; for the latter, in consideration of that interest we our selves have in our acquisitions, or in consideration of that farther happiness which may accrue to them by such acknowledgments, and which we by some tie or other, are obliged to endeavour. For neither can we think those benefits, not to be a just object of thanks, in which we our selves have an interest (As who is there that hath not in those which are conferr'd upon publick persons, and for whom we are especially ^f to give thanks ?) nor yet, but that we ought to give thanks for what have been conferr'd upon those, whose happiness we are obliged to endeavour : Because such grateful acknowledgments cannot but be thought to have in them the force of prayers, and beg new benefits, as well as to acknowledge ancient ones. Where therefore there is a tie upon us to procure anothers happiness, there no doubt it shall be equally necessary for us to thank God for the benefits he hath received ; which will consequently oblige us to thank God for all men whatsoever, because all men more or less have an interest in our care and love. I observe, *secondly*, that as our thankfulness ought to reach to the benefits of others, as well as to those which have been conferred upon our selves, so it ought to be imploy'd about all benefits whatsoever, but especially, (because they are the greatest) about spiritual ones : Inasmuch, that, if our very afflictions tend to the reformation of us, they ought to be acknowledged with the same, or a greater gratitude, than we would do those blessings, which, however much more specious, yet confer only to our temporal welfare.

f1 Tim 2.1,2.

IV. The several *species* or sorts of Prayer, come in the next place to be discoursed of, or rather such of them as are taken from the maker or makers of them. Where first I will consider, Prayer as distinguished into *mental* and *vocal*, and then as into *private* and *publick*.

I. How *exact* the former of these divisions is, I will not now stand to inquire, because the resolution thereof will be of little concernment. It may suffice here to say, that though Prayer *properly speaking*, be only the operation of the mind, and accordingly the service of the tongue but accidental to it as such; though nothing however, can in any tolerable sense have the name of Prayer, which is not also mental : Yet inasmuch as Prayer may be performed by the mind alone, or, together with the mind, by the operation of the voice ; inasmuch as though private Prayer may be performed by the mind alone, yet publick Prayer cannot have place where the voice doth not also interpose, I cannot but look upon that division as legitimate and useful, and rather peccant in the terms wherein it is expressed, than in the thing which is intended by it. To the consideration of that division therefore I will forthwith set my self, and first of all; because that is the Principal member of it, to the consideration of that which hath the name of *mental* Prayer.

Now there are two things which may seem worthy our enquiry, concerning that Prayer which hath the name of *mental*, first, what are the proper seasons of the using of it ; and secondly, what rules we ought to

to prescribe to our selves in it. The proper seasons of mental Prayer are again two, answerable to the times of our inability for any other Prayer; or our great hability for that. For it may either be at a time when we are incumbered by worldly affairs, and, it may be too, by the converse of other men, or when we have been imploy'd about some pious meditations, and by which we find our selves to have been more than ordinarily affected. For as, supposing our selves in the first estate, there cannot well be place for any other Prayer, how much soever we may be disposed to it, either by our own present temper, or the suggestions of Gods Spirit; So it cannot therefore but be thought seasonable to answer the one and the other by directing our mind to God, and either Praying to him, or giving thanks, as our own temper, or Gods Spirit shall dictate to us. Alike seasonable may that time be which succeeds to some pious meditations, and by which we find our selves to have been more than ordinarily affected. For as such affections as those ought in reason to be cherished and improv'd, which they can be by nothing more advantageously than by Prayer or Thanksgiving, as the matter of our foregoing Meditations shall invite; So our souls may be then so warm and agile, as not only not to be willing to expect the invention of words, but to receive a considerable incumbrance by intending it. In which case it is but meet to give the Soul its full scope and suffer it both to excite and represent its own Pious thoughts. But other than such extraordinary occasions as I cannot think to be proper for that Prayer which is to be performed by the mind alone; So others, it may be, will be of the same opinion, if they consider Gods generally requiring the use of the tongue in it, and the aptness of the mind to rove, even where it is determined by a prescript form of words. For if (as I shall afterwards shew) God do generally require the use of the tongue, why should we think it proper to pursue that Prayer which is mental only, unless where the other cannot at all, or not be so advantageously employ'd; Especially, when we know the mind to be so volatile and desultory, that it cannot wholly be fix'd even by those objects which come to it in an orderly series, and busie both its thoughts and senses. For how much more desultory may we think it will be when it hath nothing to fix it, but that which offers it self on a sudden to it, and beside that imploy's its thoughts alone? Upon which account I should also advise, that, when men indulge themselves in mental Prayer, they neither extend it beyond those pious meditations which gave occasion to it, and which therefore will be the best conductor of it; nor intend it any longer than they shall find their conceptions to go smoothly and regularly on: Lest instead of offering to God a reasonable service, they offer him only a heap of disorderly thoughts, and which, in truth, is little better than the Sacrifice of fools.

From *mental* Prayer pass we to *vocal*, or rather to that sort of Prayer, which to the intention of the mind superadds the expressions of the tongue; where again I will shew our obligation to it, and the use it may be of to us. The former of these I found not only upon the words of Scripture, and which (for the most part, representing Prayer under the terms of *calling upon*, and *crying* and *lifting up our voice* to God) supposeth that the voice ought generally to have its part in it, but also upon natural grounds, and to which, in things of this nature, the Scrip-
ture

^a Explic. of
the first Com.
Part 6.

ture doth generally leave us. Of this sort is the obligation that lies upon us to glorifie God with our bodies as well as with our souls, and the aptness of the tongue to minister to the glorifying of God in Prayer. For supposing (as I now may, because I have elsewhere^a evinc'd it) that we are to *glorifie God with our bodies* as well as *with our souls*, and it will also follow, that we are to glorifie him by such members thereof, as have an aptitude thereto. Which the *tongue* certainly having, and particularly for the glorifying of him in Prayer, because furnished with an ability to acknowledge our dependance on him, and the Souls inward sense thereof, we are in reason to employ it in the so glorifying of him, and accordingly either begging of him those benefits which we want, or expressing our grateful sense of those we have. And upon these grounds *private* as well as *publick* Prayer will be obliged to be *vocal*, that which is performed by *our selves*, as well as that which is offered up *in consort with others*. But because what is thus necessary to private Prayer, becomes yet more necessary to publick, inasmuch as that cannot be made without some sensible declarations of our desires, and which are equally apprehended by all that joyn in it, therefore the *vocality* thereof is to be look'd upon as having another and a farther ground, even the utter impossibility of its being made without it. The only thing remaining to inquire is, of what use this sort of Prayer may be, which yet to him that considers it will not be difficult to discover. For beside the satisfaction that may arise from our thus offering up a compleat Sacrifice, because glorifying God with our tongues as well as with our souls; the expressions of the tongue, as they may be managed, may add even to our internal fervour, and intend that heat by which they themselves were inflam'd: I do not mean by the meltingness of their tone, but by the aptness of their signification, and which experience shews to excite, or heighten those affections to which they are adapted.

^b Explic. of
the fourth
Com. Part 1.

2. Of *mental* and *vocal* Prayer what hath been said may suffice, especially considering what may hereafter be observ'd in common concerning the severall sorts of them; Proceed we therefore to entreat of Prayer as distinguish'd into *private* and *publick*, though because I have elsewhere^b delivered my thoughts concerning them, or at least concerning that divine worship which comprehends them, I shall need to say the less here. In the general I observe as touching *private* Prayer, or that which is made by every particular person apart, that it hath a sufficient foundation in mens particular wants, or as the particular benefits which they have receiv'd from the Almighty. For both the one and the other requiring a suitable representation unto God, as a testimony of our dependance on him; where the wants or receipts relate to particular persons, they ought to be as particularly represented, as which otherwise will not sufficiently declare the dependance each person hath on him. Besides, mens private wants or receipts being many times of such a nature, that they cannot conveniently be laid open unto others, either they must be acknowledg'd by them in their private Devotions, or they must not be acknowledged at all. And though it were to be wish'd, in so great a declension of Piety, that men would accustom themselves to any sort of Prayer, yet I cannot but say that Publick Prayers signifie little to those who have not also their private ones. For beside that custom, more than any thing else, sends

send men often unto those, and by which therefore we may suppose they will not be much improv'd; If men come not well prepared to them by the Devotions of their Closets, they will hardly make so particular an application of them to themselves, as their own necessities may require, and much less of the confession of sins which is there made: That which is every mans concernment being generally no mans, as well in Prayer as in other things. But when men have been accustomed to bewail their own private sins alone, when they have by so doing imprinted upon their Souls a due sense of that guilt they have contracted by them, then every though oblique touch of the publick Prayers will give them a sensible smart, and each man accordingly confess, as if he were not confessing the common errors of the Congregation, but his own particular ones.

Concerning Publick Prayer, or that which is made in common with others, much more might and ought to have been said, if I had not yet more provented my self in that Argument. But because I have elsewhere *i* declar'd the grounds upon which it is built, as well Moral as Christian ones; Because I have moreover shewn *k* how nearly we Christians are linked to each other by being members of one Catholick Church, and by which therefore publick or common Prayer must be supposed to be bound so much the faster on us: Lastly, because when I come to shew after what manner this great duty of Prayer ought to be perform'd, I shall find my self again oblig'd to speak to publick as well as private ones; I will content my self to observe here, that publick or common Prayer is naturally founded in that interest we have in each others welfare as members of the same Society, and which therefore we are joyntly either to pray or give thanks for, according as occasion shall require; that, it is founded by Christianity more particularly in that interest we have in each others welfare, as we are members of one Catholick Church; that, in regard to that, we are as occasion offers, to joyn our Prayers with any of theirs who are of the same Sacred body, but more especially with theirs who are, of that part of the Catholick Church under which we our selves are, as because of our more near relation to them, so because of the greater opportunity we have of a nearer commerce with them; that those Prayers because the Prayers of a community, are in reason to be conducted by those with whom the care of the community is intrusted, that the other members thereof are therefore to follow their conduct in them, and acquiesce in their determinations about them; In fine, supposing those Prayers to be agreeable to the laws of Christianity, that we cannot withdraw our selves from them without sin; because obliged to hold communion with the members of the Catholick Church, and more particularly with that part of it under which the divine providence hath plac'd us.

i Explicat. of
the fourth
Com. Part 1.
k Explicat. of
that Art. of
the Creed,
*I believe & be ho-
ly Catholick Ch.*

V. But because *time* is a necessary adjunct of Prayer as well as of all other duties, and because experience assures us, that what is left at large for the time, is either not at all, or very rarely perform'd; therefore enquire we in the next place, when and how often it ought to be perform'd, which, agreeably to the division before made, I shall consider first as to *publick* Prayer, and then as to *private* ones.

Of the times of *publick* Prayer much need not to be said by him, who professeth to instruct rather the Sons than the Fathers of the Church. It may suffice here to say, that as the times of Publick Prayer are of necessity

necessity to be stated, that so those who are to joyn in it, may know when they ought to meet at it ; that as those times, because the times of Publick Prayer, are in reason to be stated by those, with whom the care of the Publick is entrusted : so it will consequently be the duty of the several members of the Community, so far as they may, to present themselves at those times, and offer up their joynt Prayers and thanksgivings unto God. And farther than that private persons will not need to concern themselves, or at least not in that Church wherein we live ; because if publick Prayer be at all wanting here, it is rather through the default of those who ought to assist at it, than that either the Church hath been wanting in setting apart times for, or the Ministers thereof are unwilling to perform their proper parts in it.

There being therefore no difficulty at all as to the times of Publick Prayer, because private persons may read their duty therein in the either practice or constitutions of the Church, enquire we rather after the times of *private* Prayer, and *when* and *how often* it ought to be made by particular persons. Though, even here also, our work will be very much shortned by distinguishing between the *ordinary* and *extraordinary* occasions of it. For as, if any *extraordinary* occasion do arise either for prayer or Thanksgiving, it cannot but be thought necessary for men to lay hold of it ; So they themselves are the best, and indeed the only judges of them, and therefore to them we must leave the consideration of them. The only thing, that can be brought under any certain rules, are the *ordinary* times of prayer, and to which therefore I shall confine my discourse.

It is not unknown to those, to whom the Scriptures are not, that they often require us to *pray always* ; and as little can it be unknown to those, who are acquainted with the world, how ill a comment the practice of most men is upon it. I pretend not to assert that those Injunctions ought to be taken in the strictness of the letter, partly because that would leave no place for other duties, but more especially because some of them do manifestly respect the doing of it *at every fit season*, as others *again* the *not giving over for every refusal*, but resuming our former petitions at due distances, and prosecuting them with our former fervour. For so that parable which our Saviour spake, that men ought *always to pray and not to faint*, shews the meaning of our Saviour to be in it ; the judge, of whom he there speaks, granting the importunate Widow's request, for fear lest by her *continual coming* she should weary him ; which shews that the widow was not always upon her knees to him, but came to him oftentimes with that design. But, as for these and other such like reasons I cannot affix such a sense to those injunctions, as the letter of the words may seem to require ; so I cannot but say withal that they require at least the frequent performance of it, and particularly that injunction of *St Paul's* in which imports our praying *without ceasing* ; it appearing from the generality of those other ^o exhortations wherewith it is conjoyn'd, that something like an Universality of time is requir'd for the performance of it, which nothing but a frequency is, and such a frequency too, as may in some measure connect the several times of Prayer together. Which observation alone whosoever shall reflect upon, will find it to go farther toward the determining the times of Prayer than he was it may be aware of. For supposing, as we must, that such a frequency of Prayer is requir'd

1 Luk. 18. 1.

iv παντι και-
πω δεόμενοι.

m Luk. 21. 36.

n1 Thef. 5. 17.

o ———— 15,

16—18.

quir'd, as may, in some measure, connect the several times of Prayer together; it will not only follow, that men ought to have their set times of Prayer, but that those times ought, so far as opportunity will serve them for it, to be adjusted so near together, as to make up one continued chain: Nothing but the want of a fitting opportunity being to be thought to exclude that, which is requir'd to be incessantly done. But from hence it will farther follow, that where men have great leisure from the business of the world, and so greater opportunities for Devotion, the frequency of their devotions ought in reason to bear a proportion to those opportunities which they have for them; Which will yet farther determine them, not only to their *morning* and *evening* service, which I shall afterwards shew all men to be indispensably obliged to, but to such other extraordinary times of Devotion, as that their leisure will leave space for, and which accordingly we find to have been in use with holy men. For thus it is remarked of the *Psalmist* by himself *p*, that he *praised God seven times a day*, and by *Daniel* *p* *Psa. 119. 164.* of himself *q*, than he *kneeled upon his knees three times a day*, even when *q* *Dan. 6. 10.* he could look for nothing but death and destruction by it. And would men of leisure thus endeavour to keep up their devotions, they would not only be thereby delivered from all those temptations, which that very leisure of theirs doth expose them to, but acquire such an habitual Piety, as would make them proof against those others, which the splendour of their condition, or other such like circumstances expose them to the assault of. I direct not the same admonition to those who are more incumbered with the affairs of the world, and who therefore cannot be suppos'd to have the like opportunities for Devotion. But as I cannot but say withal, that no man ought so to encumber himself with the affairs of the world, as not to leave space for the ordinary seasons of it; so it will not be difficult even for those to connect the ordinary times of Prayer by short ejaculations at least, and which, because performed by the mind alone, will well enough insinuate themselves into, and mix with the most busy periods of their life. For nothing hinders, but, whilst the hands of the diligent woman are holding the Distaff, or those of the Labouring man are busied about his employment, the heart at least of both the one and the other may lift up it self to God in Prayer, and either implore or give him thanks for his assistance and protection. Sure I am, those of the Ancient Church went yet farther than that, yea such of the members of it as were sufficiently encumbered with the business of the world. For we find by a *learned man* of our own Nation *r*, who hath particularly remark'd the testimonies of the Ancients for it, that the *singing of Davids Psalms*, those excellent incentives to, and instruments of Devotion, *was the attendant of such persons businesses and meals*, that it *was their companion in their shops, and no less so in the field*, that *whereas the custom of the world had taught others to deceive the wearisomness and length of business by any kind of singing*, these *did it by the singing of pious and holy Hymns*; like the skilful and industrious Pilot, having at the same time their eye upon Heaven, whilst their hand was busy in guiding of the Helm. If therefore men want not a will, neither can they want means to connect the ordinary seasons of Prayer together; and nothing therefore remaining to us to shew, but what those ordinary seasons are, or rather (as was before said) that the *morning* and *evening* of every day are they. In order whereunto it falls out not

D

unhappily

unhappily, that that very *Prayer of our Lord*, to which all this is intended as an Introduction ; will go so far at least toward the proving of it, as to shew that *no day* ought to pass without private Prayer. For as it is evident on the one hand that it was intended as a pattern *f* to ours, and particularly to our private ones (for so his injoyning immediately before *t*, that, when we pray, we should enter into our Closets, shews :) So directing us, as it doth, to confine our petitions to the *bread of the present day*, it doth as clearly import our allowing every day a portion in them, because our wants of that bread are daily. It will be no less clear from the same Prayer and petition, to him who shall duly consider it, that the *morning* at least, or the foregoing part of that day, ought to have a portion in it. For though I no way doubt, but that under the title of *bread* all other the necessities of human life are comprehended, and so that petition may be as proper for the evening as the morning tide : Yet our Saviour making use of such a word as doth more peculiarly denote that which serves for our daily refreshment, and which we generally stand in need of, before the half of that season is spent, he sufficiently intimates that the time preceding it ought to have a share in those petitions, which we are thus daily to offer up unto God. All therefore that will be farther requisite for us to shew is, that the *evening* also ought to have a share in our Devotions, which yet will not be difficult to evince, even from the Scripture it self. I alledge for the proof hereof that passage of *u* St Paul where he saith, *Be ye angry u and sin not, let not the Sun go down upon your wrath*. For if I can prove them thence that St Paul did therefore admonish *not to let the Sun go down upon our wrath*, because of the inconsistency thereof with our evening Devotions ; I shall at the same time evince from that admonition of his, that such Devotions there ought to be, because proceeding upon the supposition of them. Now for that we shall need no other evidence, than what will result from the comparing of this passage of St. Paul with *Psalms* the *fourth* and the *fourth*, according to the *Septuagint* version, which the New Testament generally follows. For as in that version we read in like manner *be ye angry and sin not*, and cannot well therefore doubt of St Paul's quoting that passage from it ; so neither, considering the affinity there is between the latter clauses, but that when the same St Paul addeth, *neither let the Sun go down upon your wrath*, he did it with an eye to that which follows in the same *Psalmist*, *commune with or rather in your heart* (for so it is in the Hebrew) *upon your bed, and be still*. For what more clear and fair account can be given of that passage of St Paul, considering the manifest reverence the former part thereof hath to that of the *Psalmist*, but that he therefore forbid men to suffer the *Sun to go down upon their wrath*, lest, if it should, that *wrath* of theirs should be a hindrance to their nightly *Meditations* or *Prayers*, as the *Chaldee* *x* doth expressly interpret it. Though supposing that text not to be sufficiently conclusive, or, at least, not with those who may most need to be perswaded by it, what hath been before said concerning the seasons of Prayer will supply the defect of it. For supposing that this duty of Prayer ought to be frequently and incessantly perform'd, yea so frequently, that no day ought to pass without the performance of it ; supposing farther, that the foregoing part of the day, or the morning ought to have a portion in it, in regard of those necessities that it brings with it ;

f Mat. 6. 9.

t --- 6.

u Ephe. 4. 26.

x Ch. Paraphr.
dicte orationem
vestram in ore
vestro, & petitionem
vestram in corde
vestro.

it; and it will follow, upon the same grounds, that the evening ought to have an equal interest in it; as because of those peculiar dangers it brings with it, and against which there is the more need of the watchfulness of the Divine Providence, so because we cannot otherwise be well thought to keep up an uncessant Prayer, as the *Apostle* obligeth us to do: That being hardly worth the name of *uncestant Praying*, between the terms of which so great an interval is plac'd, as the space of a natural day, especially when the intervening night doth equally need God's assistance and our Devotions.

VI. The sixth thing to be enquir'd into is *after what manner* Prayer ought to be made; a querie which contains many others in it, but which agreeably to the things, that either constitute or attend it, may be reduc'd to these three heads, *with what frame of spirit* it ought to be made, *with what posture of body*, and *in what words*.

I. In the general I observe as to that *frame of spirit* wherewith Prayer ought to be made, that it ought to be with such a one as is estranged from all sin, or at least, such as groaneth to be so. An observation which hath Scripture and reason to justify it, the nature of him to whom we Pray, and his declarations concerning it. For to say nothing at all of the testimony of him whom our Saviour restor'd to sight, though his testimony seems to be built upon a much more solid ground than his own single observation. *Now we know y that God heareth not y* Joh. 9. 31. *sinners, but if any man be a worshipper of God, him he heareth*; It is the affirmation of one z, upon whom we may more safely rely, that if he *regarded iniquity in his heart, the Lord would not bear him*, as of God himself (for they are his words that the Prophet *Isay* delivereth) that though the Israelites *spread forth their hands he would hide his eyes from them, and though they made many Prayers, yet he would not bear, because their hands were full of Blood*; meaning thereby, that, as they had been guilty of Blood, so they had not as yet cleansed themselves from it by Repentance. Neither is the Doctrine of the *New Testament* any whit different from that of the *Old*, as indeed who could suppose it to be so, after our Saviour had said that to be the time wherein men ought to worship God *in spirit and in truth*? For we find St *Paul* exhorting men *b to lift up holy or pure hands* in Prayer, as St *James* c, where he *b* 1 Tim. 2. 8. *adviseeth to draw nigh to God, which is but a Periphrasis of that duty,* c Jam. 4. 8. *to cleanse their hands and purifie their hearts*: Both of them alluding to the *Jews* washing of themselves before their Devotions d, and which, as I have elsewhere shewn e, were intended by that God, by d Psa. 26. 6. and Hammond's Annot. on it. e Introduct. to the Expl. of the Decal. Discourse 2. whom they were first instituted, as Emblemes to us of this Sacred truth. For if God have no more regard to a clean Attire, or smooth Skin, than he hath to *Oxen* f, what should hinder us to conclude, as St *Paul* doth in that instance, that for our sakes no doubt those things f 1 Cor. 9. 8. were written, that he, who presents himself before the Lord, should appear with a clean Heart, with a Soul no way stained by any unrepented sin. In fine, so necessary is such a frame of spirit in order to the due presenting of our Prayers, that the indulging to one only sin, is enough to hinder their acceptance, yea to occasion God to reject them with indignation. Which is so true, that, when *Joshua* and the *Elders of Israel* fell down before God, upon occasion of that discomfiture which had befallen them before *Ai*, God not only refus'd to accept their Prayers, but bade *Joshua* get up g from that ground on which he had g Josh. 7. 10, 11. thrown

thrown himself, because of that sin which the *Israelites* had been guilty of: Thereby intimating that sin crys much louder than our Prayers, and either drowns their cry, or makes it ineffectual. I may not dismiss that innocent frame of Spirit which I am now upon, before I have particularly recommended to it a freedom from all *wrath* and *anger*, because the Scripture hath particularly recommended it to us; witness

b 1 Tim. 2. 8.

St. Paul's exhorting in the place before quoted *b*, that we should lift up holy hands *without wrath and doubting*. And no wonder, when, beside that distraction which it may occasion, and in regard whereof, as we before learned from the same *St. Paul*, and the *Psalmist*, we are not to suffer the *Sun to go down upon it*, it is also directly opposite to that *forgiveness* of our Brethren, upon which and which alone, that Prayer, which we are making way for, prompts us to hope for the forgiveness of the Almighty. Of such necessity is it, if we may believe the Scripture, for him who would pray aright, to bring with him a heart estranged from all sin, and particularly from anger and maliciousness; and they who do consider the nature of him, to whom we pray, will easily

i De Orat. c.

10. Neq; enim

agnosci poteris

a Spiritu San-

cto Spiritus in-

quinatus, aut

tristis a lato,

aut impediens a

subscribe to the truth of it. For *neither* (as *Tertullian* i observes) *can an unclean spirit be own'd by a pure and holy one, a sad and lumpish one by a spirit of gladness; a spirit that is entangled and distracted, by one that is free and undisturbed. No one receives him that is an adversary to himself, no one admits of such a person, as is not of like temper with him.*

libero. Nemo adversarium recipit, nemo nisi comparem suum admittit.

But to be yet more particular in describing that frame of spirit which he who would pray right is of necessity to bring with him. Where first I suppose I shall need only to admonish, that it ought to be *actually intent* upon the matter of its Petitions. For Prayer properly so call'd being only an application of the Soul to God, where that application is wanting we shall be so far from praying aright, that we cannot in strict speaking be thought to pray at all. And though I know the confidence of men is great, especially as to the expectation of their acceptance with God, yet, if they would enure themselves to consider, they would not allow themselves to think that God doth, or can hear those Prayers which they do not hear themselves. It may perhaps be more proper to admonish secondly, that they endeavour to possess their minds with a due apprehension of his greatness to whom they address themselves, and their hearts, with a reverential awe of him.

k Eccl. 5. 2.

For *God as the Preacher k* speaks, yea, as *our Lord* himself hath taught us *l* is in heaven, and we upon earth, and ought not therefore to be

l Mat. 6. 9.

approach'd without such a regard, as is due to him who is so highly exalted, and from whom we our selves are so far remov'd. Which is the rather to be observ'd, because of that indecent familiarity with God, into which men have lately fallen, and by which they have converted that, which is the business of suppliants, into that which differs little from a demand. But because I have elsewhere *m* considered the grounds of that familiarity, and shewn what our friendship with God, may or may not privileged us in, and because I may hereafter be tempted to consider farther of that awful temper which is opposite to it, I shall content my self to reflect upon one instance, which I did then omit, and which, though in appearance a ground of the same confidence, yet will serve rather to abate than increase it. For though it be said of

m Explic. of
the first Com.
Part. 5.

n Gen. 32. 24.
&c.

Jacob that he *wrestled with God n*; though it be moreover affirmed of him,

him, that he told him, with whom he wrestled, that he *would not let him go o unless he bless'd him*; in fine, though both the one and the other be principally to be understood of his contending with God in Prayer, as is plain from the Prophet *Hosea* p, yet, if we consult that very Prophet, we shall find, that *Jacob* had still a regard to the greatness of that God, with whom he had to do, he telling us in the same place, that *he wept, and made his supplication to him*: Which as it is an Argument of *Jacob's* remembring himself to be a man, and the distance that was between him and God; so it shews those words of his, *I will not let thee go*—to be only an indication of his resolution, not to leave off praying to him, till he had granted him his request. I observe, thirdly, as a no less requisite qualification of the spirit of him that prays that it be *servent* in those desires it represents; a qualification, which as *St. James* sufficiently insinuates to be its duty by subjoining the mention of it q to his exhortation unto Prayer, so is also represented by him under an unusual appellation; as if (for so the *Greek* word by him made use of signifies) the servency of him who prays ought not to be less than theirs, who are acted by a good, or possessed by an evil spirit. Only, however this may be in some measure the duty of all Prayer, because he who asks coldly, shews himself to set no great value upon the blessing ask'd, yet it is easy to see that a difference ought to be made in it, according to the different nature of the things desir'd. The consequent whereof will be first the bestowing of our fervour, rather upon those things that are necessary, than upon such as are only convenient; as secondly, upon those things which tend to our eternal welfare, than such as conduce only to our temporal one. And surely as we are apt to prosecute these with too great an earnestness, and even to beg with the importunity of *Rachel* r, *give me them or else I die*; so our too eager desire of them is apt to abate our love to those, in the beginning whereof the greatest fervour ought to be employ'd. There therefore if not all, yet let the greatest part of our fervour be bestow'd, let those and those especially be the object of our desires; so shall we at the same time inflame God as well as our selves, because desiring such things of him, as are most agreeable to himself. But of all the qualifications of the spirit of him who prays, there is certainly none more incumbent upon it by the Laws of Christianity, than its desiring of God, what it doth, *in the name* of our Lord Jesus Christ. To this our Saviour in one place appropriates his own granting what his Disciples should ask of God, and so intimates the asking in his name to be a necessary qualification of that their asking; to this he elsewhere t appropriates *God's* granting what they should ask of him, and so doth yet more strongly enforce it; In fine, to this he expressly obligeth them, for *hitherto* saith he u, *have ye asked nothing in my name*, but now ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full. The only thing that can require our farther consideration, is, what is meant by *asking in Christ's name*, which yet to an attentive mind will not be difficult to resolve. For whether thereby be meant (which may seem to be the most simple notion of it) the asking what we do as from Christ, as well as our selves, and so, that it may be suppos'd to be his desire, as well as ours; or whether thereby be meant (which is more agreeable to the *Hebrew* notion of the word x name) the asking what we do, as being both *authorized* and *encouraged* thereto by to him; Yet in as much as no one makes use of another's name

o — 26.

p Hof. 12. 3, 4.

q James 5. 16.

r Gen. 30. 17.

s Joh. 14. 13.

14.

t — 15. 16.

— 16. 23.

u Joh. 16. 24.

x Acts 4. 7.

Pla. 20. 7.

1 Sam. 17. 45.

name in his requests, but upon the account of something in him which may be supposed to be of force with those to whom he doth address them, to *ask any thing in the name of Christ*, must consequently signify in the *general*, to ask it upon the account of Christs worth and merits. More particularly, because that is but agreeable to the account we have from the Scripture concerning Christ, to *ask any thing in his name*, is to ask it upon the account of that near relation he stands in to God, and by which we may suppose God to be sway'd in his consideration of those, whose cause he is pleased to espouse. To *ask any thing in the name of Christ*, is moreover to ask it upon the account of that compliance, which he shew'd with the Fathers will in undertaking our Salvation, and by which, because a compliance unto death, we may suppose God yet more induced to gratifie him, and consider us. In fine, to *ask in the name of Christ* is yet farther, to ask upon the account of what he merited for us by that death of his, and of God's promise as well as obligation to reward it; as by the one and the other of which we cannot but think that he to whom it is alledged, will be even constrain'd to grant what we so ask of him. In the mean time, as we may see what is the benefit as well as nature, of asking what we do in the name of Christ; so it will not be difficult to discern our obligation to it, which is the only thing further to be demonstrated concerning it. For if it be by the merits of Christ that we are reconciled unto God, and thereby put into a condition, which before we were not, of receiving temporal and spiritual benefits from him; if we be consequently thereto oblig'd to acknowledge his instrumentality in them (as how can so great a favour be thought to require less of us?) Then must we also think our selves oblig'd to ask, at least, what we do, upon the account of his name and merits. Otherwise whatsoever acknowledgments we make to God of our dependance upon him, yet we make none unto the Son, in and through whom it is that we must receive any thing from the other. Not unlike is our obligation to *thank God in the name of Christ*, as St. Paul doth expressly y admonish, or, as he elsewhere z expresseth it, to *give thanks unto God and the Father by him*. For if Christ be the instrument by which all blessings are conveyed by God to us, or our thanks must reflect upon him also, or, as the Apostle expresseth it, pass to God through him. I will conclude this Discourse concerning the due qualifications of the spirit of him that prays, when I have observed from the New Testament that it ought to bring with a *firm and unshaken belief of receiving what it asks of God*. To this purpose St. Paul admonisheth that men should *lift up holy hands* without doubting as well as wrath, and St. James b, that they should *ask in faith nothing wavering*; with this farther advertisement c, that *he who so wavereth must not think to receive any thing of the Lord*. In fine, to the same purpose the Author to the d Hebrews d admonisheth to *draw near to God*, as with a *true heart*, so also with *full assurance of faith*. And no wonder, because we have by Christianity a promise e of obtaining what we ask, an assurance of God's f granting our requests, and the Sons g giving success to them. After which we cannot be excus'd for Praying with any thing of diffidence, because calling into question the word and truth of God. These two things only would be added, as due abatements of that unshaken Faith wherewith we are requir'd to approach to God; first, that this ought to be understood with reference only to such things as are according

y Eph. 5. 20.
z Col. 3. 17.
Rom. 1. 8.

a 1 Tim. 2. 8.

b James 1. 6.

c ——— 7.

d Heb. 10. 22.

e Mat. 7. 7.

f Joh. 16. 23.

g ——— 14. 13,

14.

cording to the will of him in whose name we ask. An abatement the less to be doubted of, because St. *John* himself hath led the way to it; *b. 1. Joh. 5. 14.* He giving us to understand, that *this* is indeed the confidence which we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will he heareth us. Though even this abatement may be prevented by remitting our selves, in all uncertain things, to the will and disposal of the Almighty. For so if we do, we shall not need to doubt of receiving what we ask, because asking nothing of him but what he will be sure to grant. Of no less necessity is it to add secondly, that that unshaken Faith whereof we speak, be with a *Proviso* of a proportionable assurance, in our selves, of our own being duly qualified to ask. For as by shewing the necessity of such qualifications, I have together therewith shewn that the promise of giving what we ask, is restrain'd to those in whom they are; so I must consequently be thought to evince, that such an unshaken Faith cannot be, where there is not a like assurance of the other. The consequence whereof will be, that they, who have not such a confidence of themselves, must either not ask at all, which would be an odd way of complying with that *unceasing* praying which is commanded, or that they ask with no greater assurance of obtaining what they desire, than they have of their own qualifications to desire or obtain it. Otherwise they shall lay a greater claim to the promises of God, than those promises will warrant them to do. And indeed, unless it be in appearance, neither is that abatement, whereof we speak, any way contrary to that unshaken Faith, wherewith St. *James* obligeth us to ask; because, though it may occasion those, in whom it is, to doubt of their receiving what they ask, yet not in the least to doubt of it, upon any distrust of that promise, for the sake of which such an unshaken belief is requir'd. By which means mens diffidence, such as it is, will become a diffidence of a different nature, and rather to their own present discomfort, than to the violation of the laws of Christ. Only because even such a diffidence, beside the present inconvenience of it, may in time improve into a neglect Prayer, or at least, which is not much inferiour to it, into a careless performance of it; let them endeavour to reform what they think amiss in themselves, and so make way for a more firm belief of their own being qualified to ask, as well as of God's readiness to gratifie them, if they be. The effect whereof will in fine be, their absolutely believing that they shall receive, and, which is much better than that, without any danger of being deceived, either in their belief or the object of it.

2. An account being thus given of that frame or temper of spirit wherewith Prayer ought to be made, enquire we in the next place in what posture of body. A thing, which, how slight soever it may now be thought to be, yet is not without its moment, if either *Scripture*, or *reason*, or the practice of holy men may be our Judges. For if (as I have elsewhere shewn from the first of these) we ought to glorifie God in our bodies, as well as in our spirits; if we are forbidden to bow down before a graven Image, lest we should thereby be thought by God to impart his honour to it; in fine, if our Saviour refus'd to fall down and worship the Devil, upon the account of God's challenging that honour unto himself; then must it be thought to be our duty to make use of such a posture of body towards God, as may bespeak our inward reverence, and particularly in Prayer, which is one of the most immediate

*Explic. of
the first Com.
Part 6.*

1 Cor. 6. 20.

diate acts of the glorification of him. Only, that men may be yet more sensible of the necessity there is of external reverence, and particularly in that part of God's service whice we are now upon the consideration of, I will briefly subjoyn such arguments as reason it self will offer to us, to perswade those reverential postures whereof we speak. Of this nature I reckon *first* the subjection of the body to God, and the necessity that ariseth from thence of its making a Declaration of it. For supposing, as we must, the subjection of the body to God, as being his Creature and vassal; and supposing farther (what the Scripture doth also confirm) that it ought therefore to make a Declaration of that its subjection to him, or, as St. Paul's words are, *to glorifie him*, as being *his*; it will follow, that it ought to do so much more in such acts of adoration, as are the most immediate parts of his service. Now by what ways and means shall the body declare that subjection, which we have said to be incumbent on it. Shall we say by the use of its tongue in Prayer? That indeed is one way of declaring it, but it doth not therefore prejudice the use of others, and particularly those that are made by the position of it. For if this may in some measure make the same Declaration, there is no doubt there is so far forth an equal necessity of it. Sure I am, and shall accordingly evince it afterwards, holy men have in all times made use of this sort of Declaration, which certainly they would not have done, if it had been so indifferent a thing as it hath of late years been thought to be. But this is not all we have to offer from reason as to external reverence, though I no way doubt it is the primary ground of it; for we shall find the same reason perswading to it upon the account of the aptness thereof to intend our inward reverence and devotion. Excellent to this purpose is that of St.

1 Et nescio quomodo, cum hi motus corporis fieri nisi animi motu precedente non possint, eisdem rursus visibiliter factis, ille interior invisibilis, qui eos fecit, augetur; ac per hoc cordis affectus, qui ut fierent ista precessit, quia facta sunt, crescit. Aug. De cura pro mortuis, c. 5.

Augustine l, and is certainly well worthy of our remark. *I know not how it comes to pass* (saith that Father) *but so it is, that though those motions of the body be not made without a foregoing motion of the mind, yet again by the outward and visible performance of them, that more inward and invisible one, which caused them, is increased. And so the affection of the heart, which was the cause of their being done, is it self improved by the doing of them.* Now though experience, which is all that Father appealed to, be no doubt the best proof of this (for who finds not in himself, when he is thus lowly and reverent in his outward behaviour, that his inward devotion is thereby very much intended) yet it will receive some strength from that which lies open to every man's observation, even the intimate union there is between Soul and Body. For if there be such an intimate union between the Soul and Body, that that cannot well entertain any strong affection without imprinting something of it upon the Body, neither can it be difficult to imagine, though the manner of effecting it be unknown to us, but that the motions and gestures of the Body may have some influence upon the Soul, as well as those of the Soul upon the Body. Besides, when a man shall place himself in such a posture as is not usual with him, but when he would make some demonstration of respect to the person he useth it to, that very posture cannot but be an *Item* to him, to mind that which he is about, and with all humility of Soul to adore him, before whom his Body is thus prostrate. Shall I add a yet farther Argument from reason? It doth not indeed concern all sort of Prayer, but it concerns that sort of it which most requires external reverence, even publick

Prayer :

Prayer. I mean the necessity that lies upon us *m* to provoke each other in it to the highest inward devotion and reverence. For how should any man be able to effect that, but by such outward demonstrations of it? Nay, how can he otherwise go so far towards it, as to persuade those with whom he associates, that he hath any such reverence within? Because, as was but now observ'd, the Soul cannot well entertain any strong affection without imprinting something of it upon the Body; and as that receives life and motion from the Soul, so it wears its livery and badge. For how then can we persuade our selves there is any great reverence within, where there is no appearance of it without? It is a handsom passage that of *Tertullian* n, where he faults those persons, who, in a time of sorrow and repentance, use the same vanity and luxurioulness of habit and diet, that they do at other times. *Bring hither*, saith he, *a needle to lay their hair, powder to cleanse their teeth, and a knife to pare their nails withal. If there be any artificial white and red, let the Cheeks and Lips have it, seek out the most pleasant Baths the most delicious food and purest Wines. And if any shall ask, wherefore do you all this, tell them you have sinn'd against God, and are in danger to perish everlastingly, and therefore it is, that you do thus macerate and afflict your self, that you may reconcile your self to that God, whom you have offended.* For the same may in some measure be said of those, who would be thought to be devout, even when they make no outward demonstration of it, yea, when they make use of such gestures which betoken another kind of affection. For what cause can any man have to suspect any thing of that nature in them, when their outward behaviour doth so ill agree with it? Especially when the custom of the World is, neither can we well restrain our selves from it, to make some outward demonstration of respect to those, whom we do inwardly love and honour. And indeed, though some mens prejudices will not suffer them to see the force of this reason, or at least not in those instances, whereby all men before themselves have been wont to express their regard to their Creator; yet is their practice, though otherwise different enough from ours, a sufficient proof of what I affirm, and of that reason upon which I have advanc'd it. For why else is the voice of him, who prays among them, so suited in its several tones to the nature of the things expressed? Why is his Face put into as different postures, agreeably to the one and the other? Why is the mention of Gods mercies, and his own sense of them, deliver'd in an affectionate and melting tone, and, lest that should not be enough, attended with a smile? Why is the mention of his and the Congregations sins made in as melancholick a one, with a dejected, and sometime distorted Countenance, with a sigh or a groan? Why all this I say, but to let men know, how he is affected with what he speaks, and to provoke them to the same passions and resentments? For that all these tones and gestures are not natural, and so unavoidable, otherwise than as custom may make any thing to be so, may appear from hence, that many of them are peculiar to themselves, and so peculiar, that they are known from other men by them, both by themselves and others. Though granting them to be in a manner natural, yet they will furnish us with a proof of the necessity that lies upon us all to make some outward demonstrations of that inward devotion we pretend unto. For if God and nature have so fram'd us, that we cannot well entertain

m See Explicat.
of the Fourth
Commandment,
Part 1.

n Cedo acum
crinibus distin-
guendis, & pul-
verum dentibus
elimandis, &
bisulcum ali-
quid ferri vel
aris unguibus
repastinandis :
siquid ficti ni-
toris, siquid, co-
acti ruboris, in
labia aut genas
urgeat : prate-
rea exquirito
balneas latiores
hortulani mari-
timive secessus :
adjicio ad
sumptum : con-
quirito altitium
enormem (agi-
nam, desecato
senectutem vi-
ni : cumq; quis
interrogari
cuinam ea lar-
giaris, Deliqui,
dicito, in deum,
& periclitor in
aeternum perire :
itaq; nunc pen-
deo, & maceror,
& excrucior, ut
deum reconcili-
em mihi quem
delinquendo
laesi. Tertul.de
poenitentia,
C. 21.

any strong affection without imprinting some mark of it upon the body, then cannot men be thought to be devout, who make no semblance of it, and much less so devout as to incite others to be so too. Which will leave nothing to us to enquire, but whether we are to leave it to the voice and face to do all, or whether we ought not also to evince our inward respect by some more general position of the Body. A question not difficult to be resolv'd by him, who shall consider either the end of external reverence, or the practice of those men who have been recommended to us for their holiness. For if one great end of external reverence in the publick worship of God, be to incite one another so much the more to an internal one, that way of expressing it is in reason to be chosen, by which it may become the most apparent, and consequently, because that is most visible and most apparent, by some fit and reverential position of the whole Body. How much more then, when we find holy men in all ages to have gone before us in it, those who liv'd in the times of the Gospel, as well as those who liv'd before it? For the evidencing whereof we are to know, that there were three several positions whereby the Jews first, and afterwards the Christians, were wont to express their reverence towards God in Prayer, *standing, kneeling and falling upon their face*. The first of these was the most usual among the Jews, and may be deduced from *Abraham* down to the times of our *Saviour*. For of *Abraham* it is affirm'd, that he *stood* o Gen. 18. 22. *before the Lord* o when he interceded with him for *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, which made the *Chaldee Paraphrase* render those words, *And Abraham stood yet before the Lord*, *Abraham stood yet before him in Prayer*. Of *David* in like manner it is affirm'd, that he *appointed the Levites to stand* p 1 Chr. 23. 30. *p every morning to thank and praise the Lord*, as also *at even*; of those *Levites* again in the time of *Nehemiah*, that they not only *stood up* q Neh. 9. 4. 5. *q themselves*, but called upon the people too to *stand up q*, and *blest the Lord*. And this posture was so known among them, that *Naaman* the Syrian was not without the knowledge of it, as appears from his saying, that he thought *Elisha* would have come out to him in order to his cure, and *stood r* and called on the name of the Lord. Agreeable hereto was the practice of the Jews in our *Saviours* time, as appears from several passages of the New Testament; witness its being said of the Pharisee, that he *stood s* and *prayed*, as of the Publican too, that he *stood t* though at a greater distance from the Symbols of God's presence, in fine our *Saviours* exhorting *u* that when they *stood praying* they should *forgive*. Whence it was, that עמידה or *Station*, not only became a name for Prayer among the modern Jews, but it was a famous saying among them x Druf. Annot. in Mat. 6. 5. *x* upon the account of that being their usual posture in it, that *without stations the world could not subsist*. From standing therefore pass we to *kneeling*, and which, though not of the same general use among the Jews, yet appears to have been often practis'd by them. For of *Solomon* it is affirm'd, that, when he dedicated the Temple, he *kneeled* y 2 Chro. 6. 13. *y upon his knees* *y before all the Congregation of Israel*, and *spread forth his hands towards heaven*, and said, O Lord God of Israel, &c. Of *Daniel* in like manner, even when King *Darius* had made a Decree, that no person should ask any Petition save of himself in thirty days, that he notwithstanding *kneeled upon his knees z three times a day*, and *prayed* z Dan. 6. 10. *z and gave thanks before his God*, as *aforetime*. Yea, so general was this practise of theirs, though not to the same degree with the former, that when the *Psalmist* in the *Psalms* *a* we every morning recite, would solicit

sollicit others as well as himself to make their approaches unto God, he expresseth it by saying, *O come let us worship, and fall down, let us kneel before the Lord our maker.* Lastly, As the Jews had their stations and kneeling to express their reverence to their Maker, so, upon more solemn and pressing occasions, their *throwing themselves upon their faces*; witness in particular *Moses* and *Aarons* doing so *b*, when God had them *separate themselves from the Congregation, that so he might consume them in a moment.* In one or other of these postures were Gods ancient people the Jews wont to pray; and the Christians, though they departed from them in other things, yet could not think fit to leave them here. For though there be not in the New Testament, beyond which I mean not now to look, any express mention of their *stations*, nor any thing to collect them from, beside their likelihood to conform therein to those Jews of which they were, especially when our Saviour had rather signified his approbation *c* of that posture, than his decrying it; though there be not any farther mention there of falling flat upon the face, than that our Saviour sometime *d* used it, and that the *elders in heaven* *d* Mat. 26. 39. are in the *Revelations* *e* represented as so falling when they gave thanks; *e* Rev. 11. 16. Yet is there so clear and express mention of their *kneeling* and that too at such times, and in such places, as may seem not to have been proper for the consideration of it, that it may well shame men out of those irreverent postures to which they do now indulge. For thus of *St. Peter* it is affirm'd. that he *kneeled down* *f* and *prayed*, that God would restore *f* Act. 9. 40. *Tibitba* to Life; and of *St. Paul* in like manner, that he *kneeled down* *g* and *prayed* with the Elders of *Ephesus* and others; of *St. Stephen* long before this, that he *kneeled down* *h* and *prayed* for those who were then *stoning him*; and of *St. Paul* again and the Disciples of *Tyre*, that they *kneeled down* *i* upon the shore and *prayed*. For well may we think kneeling and other reverent postures of body in Prayer to be no such indifferent things, when *St. Stephen* could think of it when the stones were about his Ears, and *St. Paul* and the Disciples of *Tyre*, when they had no other place to kneel upon than the cold and wet sand.

3. The last thing to be inquir'd into upon this head, is *with what words* Prayer ought to be made; a question which is become necessary, not so much as by any great difficulties that do attend it, as by the prejudices of men, and that dust which such prejudices are wont to raise in the clearest matters. For who otherwise could have thought, that question would have ever been made, whether Prayer might be made in such words as are unknown to him who prays, or whether it were not much more proper to consider them before-hand, than to trust, especially in publick, to such expressions as our own fancies may suggest unto us upon the place. However, because each of these hath been made the matter of a debate, I will attend to the resolution of them, and first of all of that which relates to the Language in which Prayer ought to be made.

It is the assertion of that *Church* *k*, whose *Catechism* I am now upon, *k* Art. 24. that publick Prayer ought to be *made in such a tongue as is understood* by those that assist at it. The *Church of Rome*, on the other side, determines *l*, at least as to the *Mass*, that it *seemed not expedient to its Fathers that it should every where be celebrated in the vulgar tongue*; it determines farther, *the retaining every where their ancient usage in this affair*, and which we know for the most part to be in no vulgar language;

in fine it pronounceth an anathema upon those, who say that the Mass ought to be celebrated only in the vulgar tongue. Let us now trie, either by reason, or Scripture, which of these two ought to be preferr'd, or rather whether the Church of Rome be not condemned by them both. I alledge, as to the former of these, the nature of that duty I am now upon, and which as I have shewn in the general to be an act of the Soul, so more particularly to be a representation made to God by it of what it doth desire from him, or of its own pleasing sense of what it hath already receiv'd. Now let any man, that can, reconcile this definition of Prayer, with the making of it in such a tongue, as is not understood by him that prays. For can the Soul entertain any desires of that of which it hath no knowledge, or be affected with the sense of those receipts which it is equally a stranger to? and if it cannot, must it not be much farther from making any representation of them to God? nay, is there any thing at all for it to represent to him, to whom it ought to do it? So far forth therefore as the Prayers, that are made, are not understood, they are no Prayers at all, and therefore either the common sort of men must be debarr'd from joining in them, or they must be in such a language as may be understood by them. But it may be the Scripture is more favourable to the pretensions of the Romanists, or at least not so severe upon them. For that let St. Paul be our Judge, who, if ever he condemn'd any thing, condemn'd Prayers in an unknown tongue, yea, laid a sufficient foundation for the condemning of the Romish practice in it. For if, by the Doctrine of St Paul, even he who spake by the immediate inspiration of Gods Spirit, was yet (if he speak in an unknown tongue) to keep silence in the Church, unless there were some by to interpret it; how much more may we suppose him to silence such effusions, as have not the same pretensions, especially when they may be delivered as well in a known tongue, as in an unknown? The same will be yet more evident from the reason which St. Paul assigns of his forbidding such Prayers, though extraordinary, as were made in an unknown tongue. For how (saith he) supposing that, can he, who occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen at them, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? For it appearing from that argument of the Apostles, (as which indeed it proceeds upon) that the publick Prayers ought to be such that the most unlearned person in the Congregation may say Amen to them, and it appearing farther that no one can say Amen to them, unless he be in a capacity to understand them; either they must not be offered up at all, which would destroy all publick worship, or they must be delivered in a Language which may be understood. But what now do the Romanists say to so pressing a Text? for we must not think men so well skill'd in Controversies, will let it pass without an Answer. And neither do they; for one, who revolted from us to them, and who therefore thought himself obliged to defend them, makes answer p that it is true, that the Apostle forbids Prayer in an unknown tongue, but that it is with this exception, unless either he or some other interpret. Now the Church of Rome, saith he, in the Canon before referr'd to, commands all Pastors, and all that have care of Souls, that, during the Celebration of Mass, they should frequently, either by themselves or others, expound some part of those things that are read in it, and among other things explain to them the mystery of the most holy Sacrifice, especially on Sundays and Feasts. If this

Respondent

m Ibid Can. 9.

x 1 Cor. 14. 28.

o ----- 16.

p Answer to
Dr. Pierce's
Court Sermon,
by S. C. Cap. 15.

Respondent had said, that the *Church of Rome* takes care, as well as commands, that these things should be done, he had said somewhat to the purpose, but wherein I doubt he would have found many who had been able to disprove him. But what matters a Canon of the *Trent Council*, if the Church takes not sufficient care that it be observ'd, as he himself doth not clearly affirm that she doth? For the Apostle's Argument will prevail for the condemning of their Prayers, so long as they are not interpreted. Though granting that the Church takes care for the doing of all that it enjoins, it will not come up to what the Apostle directs. For doth the Apostle say, that men may pray in an unknown tongue, if there be any to interpret it in *some parts* of it, or if it be *frequently* interpreted? Nay doth he not roundly assert, that such persons ought to hold their tongue, if there be not one by to interpret, that, whether *Doctrine*, or *Revelation*, they had to Communicate: But how then comes in this limitation of *frequently* and *in part*, what is there in the Apostles words to found it on? Nay who sees not how contrary it is to that Argument of the Apostle, upon which he founds the prohibition of such Prayers? For if the publick Prayers ought to be such, that men may be able to say *Amen* to them; if that they may be able to say *Amen* to them, they must be in a tongue that is understood; then, so far as they are not interpreted, they must continue unknown, and which therefore they, who assist at them, cannot say *Amen* to. Besides, is it not easy to see a difference between ordinary and extraordinary Prayers, between Prayers, which he, who utters, may as easily deliver in a known tongue, as in an unknown, and those which the conceiver of could utter in no other than in an unknown, because without a faculty of interpreting them. As for the latter of these, even extraordinary Prayers, as such as were immediately inspir'd, there might be reason enough that they should be uttered in an unknown tongue, and then interpreted to the people; because as they could not but be thought to contain some peculiar excellency in them, and which therefore might be for the edification of the people to hear; so unless they were first uttered in an unknown tongue, they could not have been uttered in a known, because so, he, who was to interpret them, could have had nothing to exercise that his faculty upon. But is this the case of the ordinary and standing Prayers of the Church, that that instance should be brought to justify their being delivered in an unknown tongue, and then interpreted to the people? Or if the case were so far the same in them as to the excellency of the matter, yet is it the same as to the manner of the delivery? In fine, is it not apparent to the World, that there is so far from being any necessity upon the Priest, that utters them, to deliver them in an unknown tongue, that on the contrary he may much more easily deliver them in a known? The case of the *Romanists* Prayers therefore being so different from that of the *Corinthian* Prophets, yea though they should happen to be afterwards interpreted, that exception of the Apostles will do them no good at all, and they must therefore either make it appear that their Prayers are not delivered in unknown tongue, or give over the use of them. And indeed the forenamed *Author* proceeds to tell us, that their *Latin* Prayers are not so unknown as we pretend, and he alledgeth for the proof thereof first, that that Language is well known to many in their assemblies; But what I pray is that to him who occupieth

cupieth the room of the unlearned, and who St. *Paul* supposeth ought to say *Amen* to the publick Prayers, as well as the learnedest man in them? he alledgeth secondly, that those who are not skill'd in that tongue may however attain the meaning of their Prayers, by their *Manuals*, *Primmers* and *Psalters*, where they have ready translated the *Psalms*, *Hymns*, *Prayers*, &c. But what if he who occupieth the place of the unlearned, either cannot read those *Manuals*, or be not allowed time to read and conn them well over, if he could, which every man knows is, and will always be the case of many of the common sort? Then I suppose those *Manuals* will be of no advantage to them, or to their cause who alledge such pitiful pretences. He alledgeth thirdly, the affinity of the *Latin* tongue with other vulgar ones, and which he supposeth will lead an attentive hearer in time to the understanding of their Prayers. But beside that in the mean time, their Prayers must be however unknown, neither hath the *Latin* tongue so great an affinity with all other tongues, that men may thereby come to understand it, and much less can we think that the common sort of men will, who, by reason of their dulness, ought to be more especially provided for. The same *Author* tells us lastly, that several *Popes* have given way for a dispensation in this particular, and we therefore not excusable for not having demanded it, before we reform'd our selves in this particular. But beside that we do not think there is any need of a dispensation, where we have the Scripture and reason to assure us that the publick Prayers ought to be in a known tongue; our first Reformers had experience enough of the good nature of their *Popes*, to expect that or any such favour from them, without enslaving themselves to them as much another way.

But not any longer to contend with those who seem not over confident of the lawfulness of their own practice, such pains do they take to shew that they do not *do*, that which every man *sees they do*? Enquire we rather because some among our selves will have it so, whether as the words of our Prayers ought to be in a known tongue, so it be not much more proper to consider of them before-hand, than to trust, especially in publick, to such expressions, as our own fancies may suggest unto us upon the place. For that that is the main of the Contróversie between us and those who oppose set forms of Prayer, is not only evident from their practice, which is the best comment upon mens opinions, but that that directory which was intended to disgrace set Forms of Prayer, and the Liturgy in particular, doth as much stint men as to the matter as our Liturgy it self; because prescribing them in their Prayers before and after Sermon, to pray to this *q* or that effect, as any one may see who shall take the pains to peruse it. *Now let any man, with whom the fear of God and the love of Peace doth yet prevail, sadly consider with himself first, whether when the controversie is only about words, such a disturbance ought to have been rais'd about it, in any Church or State, as to involve both the one and the other in confusion. For of what use soever new and more choice words in Prayer may be supposed to be, yet we cannot well think them to have been of such moment, as to countervail the unsetting of a well-ordered Church or State. Let it be considered secondly, that I may come more near to that which is the hinge of the present Contróversie, whether naturally speaking it be not much more proper to consider of our words

before

q Directory, p. 14. and 36. The like prescribed in the Offices of Baptism, and the Lords Supper, p. 44. and 51.

before-hand, than to trust, especially in publick, to such expressions as our own fancies may suggest unto us upon the place. For as it is easy to see that he who takes time to consider of the expressions he is to utter, shall by that means in all probability find out more proper and more affectionate ones, than he who is at the same time to conceive and utter them; so the greatness of that God with whom we have to do, and the great danger of uttering any thing before him which may be unworthy of him, or unbecoming us, cannot but make it prudent for us to take the safest course, and consequently to consider before-hand of the expressions which we utter. Which yet is no more, than *Solomon* did long since expressly advise, lest any should think this to be any private ratiocination of ours. *For be not (saith he) rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter any thing before God; for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth, therefore let thy words be few.* Where we have not only enjoin'd upon us a due consideration of our words, but an injunction moreover not to make use of many, lest even so, notwithstanding that consideration of ours, we should fall into unbecoming ones. I shall desire it may be consider'd thirdly, whether he who is forc'd to study for every word he is to utter, at the same time he is to utter them, is in a capacity of exerting the same degree of affection and devotion, with him who brings nothing with him, but what he hath before well considered of. For affection and devotion being no doubt the very Soul of Prayer, whatsoever may be thought to impair that, ought in reason to be discarded, of what use or advantage soever we may suppose it otherwise to be. Now that he, who is forc'd to study for every word he is to utter, at the very time he is to utter them, is not in a capacity of exerting the same degree of affection and devotion with him who hath before considered of all he hath to say, seems to me evident from hence, that all affection and devotion in the heart must necessarily arise from a pre-conceit in the understanding of the truth and weight of that which it is to be affected with. For if so, by how much the more strongly the Soul of him that prays hath imprinted upon its understanding the due weight of that which it is to be affected with, so much the stronger in reason must its affection and devotion be, and consequently it must be more strongly affected with that which it hath before considered of, than with that which comes but just then into its Conceptions, and upon which moreover it cannot stay, especially if in publick, but must pass from thence to other things. Besides, he, who is to pray, being in reason to take care that he utter nothing but that which may be worthy both of God and himself, that very care and the fear which it naturally produceth, especially where it meeteth with a modest and humble Soul, cannot but be thought so to take it up, as to hinder it in a great measure from employing its affections about the matter of it. For the affection of the heart being *postnate* to the conceptions of the understanding, as by which it is to be excited, neither can we think it can be well excited before those conceptions are form'd, nor that the Soul can set it self to excite it, when it is continually employ'd in the forming of its Conceptions, and of those words wherein they are to be expressed. So far forth therefore as the common principles of reason, assisted with the advice of *Solomon*, can instruct us in this affair, so far we may be sure that it is much more proper to consider of our words before-hand, than to trust, especially in publick,

f Preface to
the Directory,
P. 5.

† Zach. 12. 10.

u Joh. 19. 37.
Rev. 1. 7.

x Acts 2. 37.

y Joel 2. 28.
&c.

lick, to such expressions as our own fancies may suggest unto us upon the place. If there be any reason to prefer *ex tempore* Prayers before those which have been well weighed before-hand, it must be upon the account of some special gift which God hath vested in his Church, and which it will concern those who are the members of, but especially the Ministers thereof without any hesitancy to trust to, and set themselves to the exercise of. And indeed this is the thing which the Assertors of such Prayers maintain, and so as not only to affirm, that *our Lord Jesus Christ furnisheth all those with it, whom he calls to the office of the Ministry*, but to condemn those as *idle and unedifying*, who have not attended to it. I will not now say, though I might (and is a thing not unknown to themselves) that some of the learnedest and gravest of them have used a set form of Prayer, and so shewed by their practice that they believ'd no such gift as that to be bestowed upon all whom God calleth to the office of the Ministry. I shall chuse rather to say first, that this mode of extemporary Praying, being so contrary to the common and natural dictates of our understanding, the gift thereof ought to be very well proved from the Doctrine of the Scripture, before it be either believed or trusted to: Reason (because the voice of God) as well as Scripture being no doubt to give law to us, where the other shall not be found to over-rule. All therefore that remains to enquire, is, whether the Scripture do plainly and clearly make a promise of such a gift, which therefore I shall in the next place consider. Now as in order to that, we cannot take a better course than to survey those Texts which are alledged by the assertors of it, so I will begin with such of the Old Testament, wherein they suppose this and other such gifts to be foretold, and in one of which the *spirit of supplication* is expressly nam'd. For *in that day, saith God, I will pour upon the House of David, and upon the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and supplication, and they shall look upon me, whom they pierced.* That this Prophecy relates to the times of the Gospel I readily grant, and so must any man who considers the application St *John* makes of the last clause thereof, as which he interpreteth of the piercing of Christ, and mens wailing because of it? But that the *spirit of grace and supplication* there spoken of imports any such faculty of expressing ones self in Prayer, I utterly deny, and that not only, because it hath not the least shadow of proof to warrant it, but because the context thereof doth incline it another way; Even to shew that whereas the House of *David*, and the Inhabitants of *Jerusalem* had pierced the Messiah here foretold, God should by his Spirit so touch their hearts for it, that they should be in bitterness because of it, and become suppliants unto God for the pardon of it. A thing which had a signal completion in those Jews x to whom St *Peter* first preached, and may as signally be fulfil'd in any, how much strangers soever to the gift pretended to, whom God shall incite to look with bitterness upon him whom they have pierced. For so they may be induced to *deprecate* (as the word we render *supplications* imports) the deserved punishment of that their sin, and implore the divine grace and pardon. Though if we should grant, as we need not, that it had a reference to some extraordinary gift of prayer, and so to be of the same stamp with a Text of the Prophet *Joel* y, on which they also pretend to rely, yet will it not evict the thing for which they alledge it. For as it is apparent enough by the other gifts that are there reckoned,

reckoned, and by St. Peter's application of it ^{Acts 1. 16.} ^{&c.} to those that descend upon the *Apostles* on the day of *Pentecost*, that the *Spirit* there promised to be poured out was a miraculous one, and by which they, who were endued with it, should be as immediately acted, as they, who in the times of the law saw *Visions* and dreamed *Dreams*; so they therefore, who urge it for a special gift of Prayer in all the Ministers of the Church, must, in agreement thereto assert, that they are all of them thus inspired, and consequently, that what they utter is as much, and as truly, the word of God, as that which holy men of old, either spake or wrote by the instigations of it. A thing which as those men have not the vanity to pretend unto, so the indecencies, to say no worse, of many things they utter in Prayer, would abundantly confute them, if they did. Either therefore let them cease to urge such Texts as those for that gift whereof they speak, or let them both assert and prove the being of such extraordinary ones as were foretold by the Prophet *Joel*. For either this of *Joel* taken in all its circumstances, is nothing at all to the standing gifts of the Ministers of the Church, or it proves much more than they would have it. I deny not indeed that it was the intention of the Prophet *Joel*, or rather of God by him, to insinuate by this Prophecy not only the pouring out of his spirit upon the Apostles, but upon others also, yea upon as many as the Lord our God should call. For St. Peter, speaking no doubt with relation to this Prophecy, or promise of the Father (for other than that he doth not produce) tells his hearers there immediately upon the mention of the gift of the holy Ghost, that the promise thereof was also unto them ^{Acts 2. 39.} and to their Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God should call. I deny not farther, because of the peculiarity of the gifts there reckoned up unto the ministers of the Gospel, that we may much more strongly infer from thence, God's pouring out his Spirit upon them. But as it will not from whence follow, that God would pour it upon the generality of Christians in any other degree, than should be found to be necessary to their proper state, so neither upon the ordinary Ministers of the Church, than as should be found to be necessary for them and agreeably to the exigency of the time whereinto they should happen. For otherwise they might as well pretend to those immediate inspirations in Prayer and Preaching which we find the Apostles had. Either therefore that *ex tempore* faculty whereof we speak must be made appear to be necessary for the Ministry, and agreeable to the exigency of the present time, or it must not pretend to found it self in that promise of the Holy Ghost, which is produced for the maintaining of it. Now what I beseech you have they, who plead for this gift, to evince any such necessity? nay, who sees not that there is in truth no necessity at all of it? For neither are men now called to the Ministry, as they were of old, from out those who were naturally unqualified for it, that we should expect the influence of an extraordinary grace in the framing of their Petitions, neither do they want time to weigh and consider before-hand what they utter before God. There is no necessity, as there was of old, of confirming or illustrating our Religion by miraculous gifts (for those that appeared in the first Ages of the Church, have given a sufficient establishment to it) in fine, there is so far from being any appearance of such a necessity, that we find God hath long since withdrawn them. It therefore there is no necessity of Gods directing the Petitions of his Church in such an extraordinary way, neither is there any reason to expect it, and much less for the framing of the words wherein they should be delivered, which we see is the only

1 Ro m. 8. 26.

thing upon the matter which is left by the Directory to it. I will conclude this head when I have reflected upon a Text of the New Testament *b*, which hath been miserably and shamefully perverted to uphold unpremeditated Prayers. *Likewise the spirit also helpeth*, or helpeth with, *our infirmities*, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, *but the spirit it self maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered*. For may not the spirit of God *help* or help with us (for the word *συνανπλαμβανεται* shews, that our labour must concur with it) may it not I say help with us, as well, and more probably when we consider before-hand of our Petitions, than when we leave them to be conceiv'd at the very time they are to be uttered? And can any man then infer from this Text, that he will help us upon the place? Is not that help of his, because founded in our not knowing what we should pray for, particularly determined by St. Paul to the matter of it? and can what he says therefore be drawn to the mode of expressing our desires, which is the field wherein this gift is especially to exercise it self? In fine, is he not said to help us by groans that cannot be uttered, that is to say, by furnishing us with internal groanings and pantings, and for which we find no expressions? And can this then be drawn to the framing of expressions, nay doth not St. Paul shew by that expression of his, that the main part of the Spirits assistance, lies in the exciting of the other? Hitherto therefore nothing can appear why unpremeditated praying should pass for the Spirit of Prayer and Supplication, and we therefore no way hindred from concluding, that is much more proper to consider of our words before hand, than to trust, especially in publick, to the suggestions of our own understandings upon the place.

I say nothing at present, how nearly soever allied to the former Argument, of keeping, especially in publick, to one and the same form of sound and well premeditated words, or of the Churches and not every private Ministers having the framing of it; Because each of these will fall in yet more pertinently, when I come to entreat of the *Lord's Prayer*, and to which therefore I shall reserve the consideration of them. Instead of that, I shall set my self to shew, *of how signal efficacy Prayer is, when it is performed as it ought*, the last thing propos'd to be enquir'd into.

VII. For the clearing whereof three things offer themselves to us, and beyond which we shall not need to look to shew the efficacy thereof; first, that the disposal of all things is in the hand of that God to whom we pray, secondly, that he hath promised to grant us what we pray for, as thirdly, that, agreeably to that promise of his, he hath answer'd the Prayers of his Servants, yea, when they desir'd such things of him as were above the power of nature to perform, and could not therefore be supposed to proceed from any other than himself. For as there can be no doubt of the efficacy of our Prayers, if he, to whom we pray, be both able and willing to comply with them; so neither can there be of the former of those, if the disposal of all things be in his hand, nor of the latter, if he hath promised to answer them, yea evidenc'd the fidelity of his promise by answering them as to such things, which could not be suppos'd, to proceed from any other than himself. To the establishing therefore of the things propos'd, I will forthwith address my self, though a very few words may suffice to give us an account of them.

1. Of the first of these much need not be said, because the Doctrine of Providence, which hath been elsewhere sufficiently established, gives a sufficient attestation to it. For which cause it shall suffice me to observe from the scripture, that it is God that killeth and maketh alive, *that bringeth down to the grave and raiseth up*; that it is he who giveth *men riches and wealth* e, and (which is oftentimes wanting, where the other is not) power to eat of it and rejoice in it; that honour as well as riches, cometh of him, that *it is in his hand to give strength*, as well as either riches or honour, that *victory is his* g, and *safety* h of him, that *every good gift, and every perfect gift* i cometh down from this father of lights, yea, as the following Verse k shewes our being begotten to himself; in fine, that *there is no wisdom, nor counsel, nor understanding against him*, that the hearts even of Kings are in the hand of the Lord as the Rivers of Water m, and he turneth them which way soever he pleaseth. For these and such like Texts shew plainly, that the disposal of all things is in the hand of that God to whom we pray, and consequently that he cannot be without an ability of gratifying our requests, whatsoever the matter of them is, or what endeavours soever there may be to defeat us of them. If there be any scruple in this affair, it must be as to his willingness to answer our Prayers, which yet there want not sufficient Arguments to establish.

2. For we have to assure us thereof the many promises he hath given us of it, and especially those he hath made to us by his Son; such as is in particular, that of *Ask and ye shall have* n, and that much more explicit one, which is elsewhere o mention'd by him: Where after he had told his Disciples, that if they had *faith and did not doubt*, they should be able to remove Mountains, and cast them into the Sea, he subjoineth thereupon (which shews, that even such effects are within the power of Prayer) that *all things whatsoever they should ask in Prayer, believing they should receive*. And indeed as there is reason to believe from that and another Text, which I shall by and by produce, that the several Miracles which were wrought of old were by the efficacy of that duty which we are now insisting on; so we have to confirm us farther in the fidelity of the former promise, and the efficacy of Prayer.

3. God's answering the Petitions of his Servants, when they ask'd of him such things, as were above the power of nature to accomplish, and which therefore could not be supposed to proceed from any other than himself. For thus, to shew of what avail the *servent Prayer of a righteous man* is, St. James tells us p, that *Elias* shut and opened Heaven by his Prayers, that he *prayed earnestly that it might not rain, and it rained not upon the earth by the space of three years and six months, and he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit*. From whence as it is farther probable, that it was by the Prayer of Faith, as St. James speaks q, that all Miracles of old were wrought (because all that the Scripture saith concerning this of *Elias* was, that there should be no rain r but according to his word) so it is yet more evident that nothing, how Miraculous soever, is impossible to it even now, if there be a just occasion of exerting it: Partly because St. James ascribes the efficacy of *Elias* his Prayer, to the fervency of that, and the strength of his Faith, and partly because he proposeth his example and success as an encouragement to those he wrote to, to pray for one anothers pardon, and recovery, and particularly to the *Elders* of the Church. For

e Explic. of the Apostles Creed Artic. I believe in God.

d 1 Sam. 2. 6.

e Eccl. 5. 19.

f 1 Chro. 29. 12.

g — 11.

h Pro. 21. 31.

i James 1. 17.

k — 18.

l Pro. 21. 30.

m — 1.

n Mat. 7. 7.

o — 21. 22.

p James 5. 17.

q — 18.

q James 5. 15.

r 1 Kings 17. 1.

what pertinency could there have been in that allegation of his, if the same things were not possible to the Prayers of other men, which we find to have been effected by that of *Elias*? If there be not now, *in some measure*, the same efficacy of Christian Prayers, it is very much to be fear'd, it is because there is not in them the like fervency, and Faith, or other such necessary qualifications of them. For though, considering the establishment that hath been given to Christianity, there be not now the like necessity of Miracles, and they therefore not to be allke expected or believed; Yet as the standing necessities of the Church are, and always will be the same, especially its spiritual ones, so nothing hinders us to believe, that God will be ready enough to exert an extraordinary power toward the supply of them, and therefore neither, but that, if occasion be, we may beg of him the exerting of such a power, and be assured in our selves of the granting of it.

D I S.

DISCOURSE III.

OF THE

LORDS PRAYER.

Where after an account of the value that ought to be set upon it in respect both of its Author and our assurance of it, inquiry is made for what ends it was prescribed by him, which are shewn to be first, to be a pattern to our own, and secondly, to be made use of by us as a set form of Prayer, and as a badge of that service which we owe to the Author of it. This latter evidenc'd at large from the story of its Institution, and confirmed farther by the use of it in the Ancient Church, the story whereof is thereupon deduc'd. Enquiry in like manner made, what place it leaves for the use of other Prayers, where accordingly is shewn what ground there is for them, both from the Scriptures and from reason. The Lords Prayer considered again with a relation to set forms of Prayer, and inquiry accordingly made what Authority it gives to other set forms of Prayer, and particularly to those which are fram'd by the Publick Authority for the service of the publick assemblies.

IN that excellent *Dialogue of Plato*, which hath the title of *Ἀλκιβιάδης Δεύτερος*, and where in the person of *Socrates* he both lays open and censures the many absurd and pernicious Prayers of the Sons of men, he at length brings in the same *Socrates* admonishing to give over praying, till men could come to be better instructed in it; withal intimating that a man should come, and whom *Alcibiades* and others were beloved by and taken care of, who should teach them to pray with more wisdom and advantage. I know not whether what that excellent person presaged were built upon the bare presumption of the divine goodness, or whether God, who sometime put a word of Prophecy into the mouth of *Balaam* and *Caiaphas*, did not also direct him so to speak; but sure I am, what he so foretold hath been signally compleated in our Lord and Saviour. For here we have not only that care and admirable kindness to mankind which that excellent person spake of, but also a Form of Prayer commended to us, and which if we use, or model our own Prayers by, we cannot have the least jealousy of begging ought of God, which may be displeasing unto him, or prejudicial to our selves. That therefore, as it will be worth our while to consider, and endeavour to investigate the sense of, so I will set my self to the doing of it, after I have first premised something concerning the Author of it, the ends for which he prescrib'd it, and the use which it hath obtain'd from the beginning in the Christian Church; what place it leaveth for the offering up of other Prayers, what Authority it gives to other set Forms of Prayer, and particularly to such, as are fram'd by Publick Authority for the service of the Publick Assemblies.

I. As to the first of these there needed not any thing to have been said,

^a Mat. Gofp.
Luke

faid, if the perversenefs of this Age had not made it neceffary to be done. But becaufe even this Prayer, as well as the other Monuments of our Religion, is fallen into contempt, or at leaft hath not obtain'd that refpect which I conceive to be due unto it, I cannot forbear to admonish, that it hath no other for its *Author*, than *him* who is the *Author of our Religion*, and that *that* is warranted to us, not only by the uninterrupted tradition of the Church, as the Creed of the Apostles is, but by the Sacred Scriptures, yea such *a* of them, concerning which there was never any doubt in the Church of God. For though that be no more than every man knows and acknowledgeth, and the mention thereof therefore so much the more unnecessary to be made; yet is it more than many persons seem to reflect upon with any care, or regulate their own practice by; as will appear, if we consider for what ends is was prescrib'd, and without the knowledge whereof we shall discourse but loosely concerning it.

II. Now there are two *ends* for which the most excellent Prayer may seem to have been prescrib'd, *first* to be a pattern unto those which we our selves put up to God, or secondly, to be made use of by us in the words wherein it was delivered, and as a badge of that service which we owe to the Author of it.

^b Mat. 6. 9.

^c --- 7, 8.

^d --- 9. &c.

1. Of the former of these there was never yet any doubt, nor indeed can there well be since our Saviour hath taught us to pray after the same *b manner*; But I must say withal that it seems to me to have been intended for a pattern, as to the shortness of our Prayers, as well as to the subject matter of them. For our Saviour having in the words immediately before *c* cautioned his Disciples against the prolixity of the Heathens Prayers, and indeed their rather *babbling* than *praying*; having moreover in the following ones *d* commended to them though a very comprehensive, yet withal a very short and compendious Prayer what can more reasonably be thought to be the meaning of *After this manner therefore pray ye*, than that they should use the like brevity in theirs? That as it is a sense of which our Saviours admonition is manifestly capable, so being the most natural inference which could be made from those words, from which he immediately infers it. However the shortness of our Saviours Prayer, and the caution he before gives against multiplicity of words in it, cannot but give occasion to suspect that this might have been in part his meaning, and we therefore not without reason to enquire, how far we ought to follow him in it, as well as in the subject matter of his Petitions.

^e Eccl. 5. 2.

^f Mat. 6. 7.

^g --- 8.

For the resolution whereof nothing seems to me to be of greater moment, than those words of Solomon which I before made use of *e*. *For God is in heaven, and thou upon earth, therefore let thy words be few*. For if that admonition of his be well founded, as there is no doubt it is, the words of our Prayers ought to be as few as may be; because it is a like certain, that *God* is now as much *in heaven*, and *man upon earth*, as they were in the days of Solomon. And though the sense we usually put upon that *Battology* *f*, which our Saviour condemns, may seem to incline his words to the prohibiting only of such, as were either perfectly insignificant, or unnecessarily repeated; yet whosoever shall consider the reason of his forbidding our being *like the heathen* in it *g*, will find something else to have been intended by it. For forbidding us to become like unto the Heathen in that their *Battology*, or
much

much speaking, because God knows what things we have need of before we ask him, he plainly intimateth that vice to have place, where the words that are employ'd, are expressive enough of our necessities and desires. Thus much therefore is evident from the advices of *Solomon* and our *Saviour*, that the words of our Prayers ought to be as few as may be, and nothing therefore left us to enquire, but what words may be thought to be sufficient for them, which I shall therefore set my self to consider.

In order whereunto I know not of any better expedient, than to consider for what ends words may be supposed to be employ'd, which I conceive to be either *first*, to *express* to God the esteem we have of him, and our own desires, or to *intend* both the one and the other in our selves, or others. For there being no other imaginable ends, for which words can be supposed to be employ'd, what shall be found to answer those ends, will be found to be sufficient for those Prayers in which they are employ'd. As to the former of these a very few words may suffice, because we know we speak to one, who knows, without any Declaration from us, what that esteem and desires of ours are. And were it not that God requires of us the service of our tongues as well as Spirits, even those words which we employ would be better omitted than us'd: Because the thus declaring of our esteem or desires looks like the suggesting unto God what he before was ignorant of, which is rather to reproach than honour him. If therefore there be any use of multitude of words, it must be as those words may be supposed to intend our own or others esteem of that God to whom we pray, or those desires we ought to bring with us of the thing we ask. But neither as to this, will there be found to be any such necessity of multitude of words, as may at first view appear to be. Because first, both the one and the other of these may and ought to be procur'd in part by an habitual piety, and a previous contemplation of him to whom we pray, and of those things which we ought to ask of him. A thing the rather to be advis'd, because those affectionate words, which we employ, will otherwise confer little to the heightning of them. For these passing away, as they are uttered, will not help much to heighten our affections, if they were not before in a good disposition to it. Again, though words may be of signal use to intend our desires of the things we ask, and thereby approve them so much the more to that God, to whom we represent them, yet will there be no need at all of them as to our desires of earthly blessings, because we need no spur at all to them: Which will consequently leave nothing for us to do, but simply to represent such desires, and for which therefore a very few words may suffice. And though the like be not to be said as to the desires of spiritual blessings, because those desires of ours can never be too fervent; yet as those desires may be better intended by previous meditations, than by any the most affectionate words, so it must be rather the *propriety*, than the *multiplicity* thereof, which will produce that effect in us: Which will consequently oblige us rather to attend to the choice, than to heap up a multitude thereof. It is to be observed thirdly, that of what use so ever words may be toward the intending of our affections, and so also toward the approving them so much the more to God; yet as they cannot produce that effect any longer, than the mind can be supposed to be intent upon the subject matter of them, so they are accordingly so

to be moderated, that he, who makes use of them, may keep up his intention upon them : By which means so many of them must of necessity be retrench'd, to which we cannot adapt a suitable intention. It is to be observed fourthly, that though an extraordinary occasion, or an extraordinary disposition of mind may so awaken our intention, as to make it hold out to a more than ordinary length ; upon which account we find our Saviour to have sometime continued a whole night ^b in Prayer to God : yet as I find no reason to believe that any meer man can promise to himself the same continued intention, and must therefore, even upon such extraordinary occasions, admonish him to consult rather his own abilities, than our Saviours practice, so I can find less reason to believe that any man can promise it to himself, in the ordinary course of his Devotions. Which suppos'd, there will be no difficulty to persuade men, that their words ought to be few, but however not more, than their intention will well reach unto; Lest happily, as the forementioned *Solomon* observes, they offer to God the *Sacrifice of fools* (for so no doubt the most proper words are, which have not the intention of the mind accompanying them) and indeed rather any thing, than the *Sacrifice of Prayer*. For Prayer (as was before-said) being, in strictness of Speech, no other than the application of the Soul, those words must be suppos'd to have nothing in them of Prayer, which are not attended with a due intention. Such evidence you see there is that the words of our Prayers ought to be few, whether we have a regard to the nature of the duty it self, or the advices of *Solomon* and our Saviour, and we therefore (considering our Saviours subjoining this short Prayer of his to his condemning of the Heathens *Battology*, and commanding us thereupon to pray after his example) to understand that Prayer as a *pattern* to ours, for the *compendiousness* thereof, which was the first thing to be evinced by us.

^b Luk. 6. 12.

ⁱ Eccl. 5. 1.

^k Mat. 6. 14.
35.

But because it hath been always thought, that the Prayer, I am now upon, was intended as much or more for a *pattern* for us to follow in the subject matter of our petitions, therefore enquire we in the next place what evidence there is thereof, though I shall not need to say much toward the evidencing thereof. For though, for the reasons before-mentioned, nothing more may seem to be meant by *after this manner pray ye*, than that we should use such a compendious Prayer, as that which he hath commended to us ; Yet for as much as our Saviour is so particular in setting down what things we are to pray for, with respect to *God's glory*, and our own either *temporal* or *eternal welfare* ; for as much as he afterwards ^k insists upon the great necessity of one of its Petitions, even that whereby we are taught to beg the *forgiveness of our own sins as we afford the same forgiveness to the sins of others* ; Lastly, for as much as that *Sermon* of our Saviours, in which this Prayer of his is recorded, appears by the whole contexture of it to design an *Abstract of Christian duty*, and cannot therefore be thought to forget so considerable a thing in Prayer, as the *nature* of those Petitions which it ought to present ; for these reasons, I say, it is but necessary to understand by *after this manner pray ye*, that we ought to *model* also our Petitions by the *subject matter* of his, and accordingly beg of God those blessings which are there ask'd, and the averting of those evils which are there in like manner pray'd against. And in this sense the whole Christian Church have ever understood it, and therefore I shall no longer insist upon it.

2. The Lords prayer being thus considered as a *pattern*, which is one of those ends for which I have affirmed it to have been prescrib'd, let us now look upon it as also intended as a *set form*, and accordingly to be made use by of us in those very *terms* wherein it was delivered. What ground there is to believe it such shall by and by be declared, both from the express words of our Saviour, and the practice of the Church. Give me leave only, before I pass to that, to enquire whether there were not reason enough for the use of it in that notion, though no such express injunction should appear. That which occasions me the rather to ask that question, is a concession of those, who seem to have been no great Friends either of this form or of any other. For though the Authors, of the *Directory* did not think fit to declare, that that Prayer, which we are now upon, was intended as a Form, yet they stuck not to recommend it to be used in the Prayers of the Church, ¹ upon the score of the *comprehensiveness* thereof. I will not now inquire why, after such a recommendation, we could generally hear as little of it, as of any part of the Prayers of our Church. It is a question, which may perhaps be more fit for them to ask themselves, than for us to concern our selves about. Instead of that I shall make it my business to shew, that there want not reasons to recommend the use of it, whether we do consider the probable *infirmities of our own Prayers*, or our own *personal* ones. For have we not reason enough to believe first, that our own prayers may be oftentimes defective, whether through our own inadvertency, or the insisting more particularly upon some Petitions which are most agreeable to our present state? Have we not as much reason to believe they may be so, through the little liking we have to those *things* which we ought to desire, or the *terms* upon which we are to ask them? I appeal for the proof hereof to a Petition which is sufficiently known and which no man I believe did ever yet wholly forget: That, I mean, which prompts us to ask the *forgiveness of our trespasses*, and which we find to be too burdensome not to desire to be eased of. For how seldom do we hear any man add, out of this prayer of our Lord, *as we forgive them that trespass against us*? How hard a matter is it to digest so severe a condition of asking pardon, how willing are we to forget it, especially labouring under any injury? And yet if this Prayer of our Lords be only a pattern unto ours, it ought not to be forgotten, and we may as well hope to obtain pardon without asking it, as without asking it upon that condition. And is there not then reason enough to have Prayer in our mouths, as well as those of our own framing? Is there not reason enough, as the *Directory* prompts us, to make use of the comprehensiveness of that, to supply this and other such like probable defects of our own? For though if we were not furnished with such a comprehensive Prayer, we might well enough hope the passing by of all the involuntary defects of ours, yet certainly not so, where we have so ready a means to supply them, and yet refuse to make use of it. But it is not only the probable defects of our own Prayers which do call for the use of this, though that in the judgment of the foremention'd persons is a reasonable inducement to it. For we have farther to consider, whether, together with more allowable Petitions, we may not oftentimes mix such Petitions, as might have much better been omitted. A consideration which I could wish there were less reason to suggest, than a due observation of mens

¹ Directory of
Prayer after
the Sermon, p.
38.

practice will warrant us to suppose. But as there is nothing more usual, than to mix our own, either interests or opinions, with other more allowable Petitions; so our great aptitude thereto may prompt us to atone for it, by the use of such a Prayer, wherein there is not only no danger of any such miscarriages, but a clear direction to us to desire the promoting of Gods *Kingdom*, and *will*, rather than then accomplishing of *our own*. Though supposing thirdly, our own Prayers not to be peccant in either of these, and therefore neither in the *matter* of them; yet if we cloath our desires in such *terms*, as are no way suitable to the Majesty of God, or the meanness of those persons that utter them, even so will there be reason enough to make use of such a Prayer, which is as innocent in its *expressions*, as *matter*. And what reason there is for the former supposition, I had much rather they, who are concern'd, would consider of, and lament, than put me to the proving of. Sure I am while there are such errors, or a probability of them, it can be no ill advice to prompt men to have recourse to that Prayer, where there can be no danger at all of begging any thing that is unfit to be asked, or in other terms and expressions than are fit to be us'd. Such reason is there for the use of that Prayer I am now upon, if we have a regard only to the probable infirmities of our own; How much more, if we also attend to our *personal infirmities*, and particularly to the *aptness* of our *minds*, either to *flag* or *wander*, especially if engag'd in a Prayer of any length? For how reasonable may we then think it (as I have elsewhere *m* observed) to rally together all the Forces of our Soul in this, and (as it will not be difficult to do) so to intend each Petition of it, that what was failing in our own, may be both made amends for, and abundantly supplied here.

*m*Explic. of
the Fourth
Command.
Part. 5.

n Mat. 6. 9.

• Luk. 11. 1, 2.

I have hitherto insisted on such Arguments as do only recommend the use of the Lords Prayer, though, as it seems to me, in so forcible a manner, that they, at least, who are not wont to think well of their Prayers before-hand, will find it a hard matter not to account of them as necessary ones; I come now, as I before promis'd, to represent it as a thing enjoind upon us, and for which we want not the *command* of him, who was the Author of it, and (which is no doubt the best comment upon it) the consentient *practice* of the Christian Church. For though I am not so well satisfied of that being the importance of *Christs* command in St. *Matthews* Gospel *n*, partly because the word *our* is capable of another sense, and partly, because, however it might have been intended by our Saviour, yet it appears not to have been so understood by those Disciples to whom it was address'd, inasmuch as one of them afterwards desir'd him to teach them to pray, as St. *John* also taught his Disciples; Yet can I as little discern, how we can avoid the command in St. *Luke* *a*, and which our Saviour took occasion from that desire of his to give. For it came to pass, saith that Evangelist, that as our Saviour was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his Disciples said unto him, Lord teach us to pray, as John also taught his Disciples, And he said unto them, when ye pray, say, Our Father which art in Heaven. For do not those words, when ye pray, say, Our Father, express the use of the Prayer it self, nay, can they be fairly drawn to any other sense than that? Is not that, which is required to be said, delivered in the Form of a Prayer? Doth not the word *say* in its prime and literal importance denote the rehearsing of it? And can there then be a more cogent

cogent proof of the use of the Prayer it self, nay, could it have been more cogent, if he had added to that advise of his, the praying in those very words that followed? For though, if that had been added, it had been much more explicit, yet the sense of it had been the same, inasmuch as it is a certain form of words which they are directed to pronounce, which makes it perfectly equivalent to the other. But it is not only the words wherein this command of Christ is delivered that we have to found our selves upon, though that alone might satisfy any reasonable man; for we have farther, as Mr *Mead* hath long since observed, the delivery of this command and Prayer here, at another time, and upon another occasion, than that mentioned by St *Matthew* was, yea long after the delivery thereof. For whereas that command which St *Matthew* recounts was delivered at his *Sermon on the Mount*, and so at our Saviours first entrance upon his Prophetical Office; it is manifest from St *Luke*, who delivers the same Sermon, though in a shorter Form, in the sixth Chapter of his Gospel, that the command recited by him here was delivered long after: As will appear not only from the distance wherein he hath here set it, but from his marking in the intermeditate Texts, things which hapned after that Sermon of his, and which are accordingly affirmed by himself *q* so to have done. Again, whereas the command mention'd by St *Matthew* was not only delivered at Christ's Sermon on the Mount, but as a part of those instructions he then thought fit to give; this in St *Luke*, as that Evangelist tells us was not delivered as a part of any set Discourse, or by occasion of one, but upon a request which was made to him, immediately after he had done praying, that he would teach them to pray as *John* also taught his Disciples. Both which things whosoever shall consider, will find them to add farther strength to our Saviours requiring the use of the Prayer it self; because he, who now said, *when ye pray, say Our Father*, had long before instructed his Disciples after what manner they were to pray, yea propos'd this very Prayer to them in order to it. For it being not to be thought that they would again have asked that in which they had been before so fully instructed, neither can we think it to have been his meaning, in his answer to them, to instruct them as to the *matter* or *manner* of their praying, but as to a *Form* which they were to use, when they address'd themselves to the Almighty. Of which yet if there remain any scruple, we have for a farther confirmation of it the Disciples desiring him to teach them to pray, as *John* also taught his Disciples. For the understanding the force whereof we are first to know, that the Disciple here mentioned, did not simply desire our Saviour to teach them to pray, but to teach them to pray as *John* taught his Disciples; as *secondly*, that he did not desire him to teach them to pray after any singular example of St *John*, but (as the words *αὐτοὺς* do manifestly import) according to the general practice of the *Hebrew Masters* towards their Scholars, and which it seems St *John* also followed. Which two things being compar'd with the known practice of the Hebrew Masters, and the necessity the generality of men stand in of a Form of Prayer, will evince such a Form to have been the desire of this Disciple, as that desire and our Saviours answer to it, that he intended his own Prayer as such. For it being customary with the *Hebrew Masters* to teach their Disciples a particular Form of Prayer, and such a Form being no more than necessary to the generality of the common sort; nei-

p *Mead*. Dife.
on Mat. c. 2.

q *Luc*. 7. 1.
-----8. 1.
-----9. 1.
10. 1

r *Lightfoot*.
Horæ Hebraicæ
in Mat. cap. 6.
Ver. 9.

ther can we think but that St *John*, who wrote after their Copy, commended such a Form unto his Scholars, and that the Disciples here mentioned desired such a one for themselves. Again, being our Saviour did not only no way disallow of this request of his, but shewed as ready a compliance with it; being he not only, in order to it, presented them with a Prayer, but oblig'd them, when they prayed, to the *saying* or reciting of it; neither can we think, but that, agreeably to St *John's* and the *Hebrew Masters* practice, he intended his own as a set Form, and which accordingly should be made use of in those very terms wherein he had delivered it.

f Sacred Me-
dit. c. 16.
: Th. Long's Ex-
ercitation con-
cerning the
Lords Prayer.

I deny not indeed that several objections have been made against this, (as what is there which the prejudices of men will not find out exceptions against?) But as I no way doubt that the prime ground of all those exceptions against the Lords Prayer was its being the *warrant* and *original pattern* of all set Liturgies in the Christian Church, as the late *King* did long since observe; so their other exceptions have been so fully answered by one of our own Nation, that I shall refer my Reader to him for his farther satisfaction in it. It shall suffice me to take notice of their alledging, that what we affirm to have been so enjoind, is not found to have been practis'd by those very Apostles to whom it was delivered, nor yet it may be by those Christians who immediately succeeded them. What truth there is in this allegation shall then be examin'd, when I come to shew of what Antiquity the use of the Lords Prayer is in the Christian Church: At present I shall admit of what they alledge as true, but withal oppose my self against it as no way prejudicial to the thing affirm'd. And the reason of my so doing, is first, because the command of our Saviour for the use of it is, and ought to be, of more force with us, than any probabilities whatsoever, that it was not used by the Apostles. For if the Authority of our Saviour be paramount to that of his Apostles, as it must be allowed to be, because the Fountain of the other; how much more may we suppose the known and avowed Authority of our Saviour to be paramount to any probabilities we have concerning the contrary Authority of the Apostles, which is all we have in the present case? For neither do the Objectors affirm that the Apostles either for bad, or did not make use of the present Prayer, but only that it doth not appear by the New Testament that they did, which is but a probable Argument of their not using of it. I say secondly, that as the silence of the New Testament, as to the Apostles use of the Lords Prayer is but a probable Argument of their not using of it, so it is far less probable than the grounds we have to believe that it was used by them, if we consider only the former command concerning it. For as if it were prescribed by our Saviour under the notion of a set Form, there is no doubt it was so used by the Apostles, whatever silence there may be in the New Testament concerning it; So that it was so prescribed by him, and accordingly us'd by them, is at least more probable, than their not using it can be suppos'd to be from the silence of the New Testament concerning it: Because for the former of these we have the letter of the Text, and other such positive proofs, for the latter only a negative one. For though a negative Argument be not without its force, yet not where it is confronted by positive ones; because these tend directly and immediately to the establishing of the thing in question, the other indirectly, and by

by the mediation of several things, which must be supposed to give it force. For neither can the silence of any Author concerning this or that particular, be of force to shew it never was, any farther than it may appear that he could not be ignorant of it, or if he were not, that he was under an obligation to take notice of it, whether by the momentousness of the thing it self, or the necessity of that Argument which he propos'd to himself to handle. For, if either of these were wanting, he might well enough omit the mention of it, what evidence soever there was concerning the being of it. I say thirdly, that though the Writers of the New Testament could not be ignorant of the usages of the Apostles, and therefore neither of their use of the Lords Prayer in the publick Assemblies, if it were really used by them; yet were they under no obligation to mention it, either from the momentousness of the thing it self, or the nature of those Arguments which they propos'd to themselves to handle. For what need could there be of their taking notice of the Apostles use of the Lords Prayer, when it was not only known to those, to whom they immediately wrote, what their practice was, but they themselves had moreover acquainted the World with our Saviours injunction of it, and thereby made it unnecessary to add any farther Arguments for it? For if our Saviours Injunction was enough, as no doubt it was, the usage of the Apostles was unnecessary to be mentioned, and they therefore, who transmitted their acts unto the World, under no obligation *so far* to make any particular remarks concerning it. Otherwise why should not the same persons, especially entreating so often as they did concerning the baptizing of Jews and Heathen, have sometime or other taken notice of their being baptized by the Disciples *in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, according as our Saviour *u* had expressly injoin'd *u* Mat. 28. 19. them? Which yet they are so far from doing, that they generally express it by baptizing *only* into the *name of Christ*; not (without doubt) that the Disciples omitted the mention of the other two persons (for who can think they would have departed so far from the Injunction of their Master?) but that they presum'd those two persons would be understood from the account which they themselves had given of our Saviour's Command for baptizing in the name of each of them. If therefore there was any obligation upon the Writers of the New Testament to take notice of the Apostles use of the Lord's Prayer, it must arise from the necessity of those Arguments which they propos'd to handle, which yet there is far less reason to affirm. For where ever, after the story of the Gospels, do they take notice of the Lords Prayer at all, or set themselves to explain or recommend it in any sort, which would have been one proper season for the mention of the usage of it? Nay where ever do they make any mention of the Form of their publick service, which may seem to have been another season for it, and indeed the only one beside that I can imagine? On the contrary, as they are perfectly silent as to the former, so they are as silent as to any particular description of the latter, and may therefore be presum'd to have been under no obligation at all of taking notice of the use of the Lord's Prayer, how frequent or notorious soever we should suppose it to have been.

• III. I have dwelt somewhat long upon my Answer to the former exception, not so much for any great difficulty there is in the exception it self,

self, but because I conceive it will not a little strengthen what I am now going to offer toward the shewing this Prayer to have been us'd from the beginning in the Christian Church, which is the next thing to be demonstrated by us. For supposing (as now I may, because I have already evinc'd it) that our *Saviour's Injunction* for the use of it is a more probable proof of its having been used from the beginning, than the silence of the *New Testament* concerning it, is of the omission of it, and it will follow at least from thence, that it is much more probable that it was so us'd, than it can be suppos'd to be, that it was not; Because all that is, or can be said to shew, that it was not us'd from the beginning, is the silence of the *New Testament* concerning it. Again, supposing also, because that hath in like manner had its proof, that the Writers of the *New Testament* were under no obligation to take notice of that usage, supposing it to have been really such, and it will also follow from thence, not only that we ought not to expect any strict proofs from them, but that there may be place for proofs of a lower nature, yea that such proofs as those ought to be look'd upon as no contemptible ones; Partly, because (as was but now said) those Writers were under no obligation to furnish stricter ones, and partly because the reasons we have to believe the *Injunction* of that Prayer by Christ may well be thought to supply the defects of the other proofs: An *Injunction* of Christ, so far forth as it may appear, being, as to the Apostles, a sufficient proof of a conformable practice, because there can be no doubt of their yielding obedience to it. It will be no less reasonable to affirm thirdly, upon the score of the former supposals, that there may be place also for those proofs, which are borrowed, either from the usances, or testimonies of such of the following Ages, as may be presum'd to have been acquainted with the practice of the Apostles. For though proofs, which are so far remov'd, are not easily to be admitted, where the thing to be proved by them hath no countenance at all from the Scriptures, because it is not easy to conceive, but that if such a thing really were, there would be some footsteps of it there; Yet the like is not to be said where the thing to be prov'd hath any countenance from Scripture, and particularly from the *Injunctions* of our Saviour: The *Injunction* of our Saviour, as hath been more than once said, being, as to his Apostles, a sufficient proof of a conformable practice, and therefore much more lending Force to such subsequent proofs, as shall be found to agree with it. All therefore that will concern us to enquire upon this head, is whether the Scriptures will afford us any proof of this supposed practice of the Apostles, and what concurrent proofs there are in the either usances or testimonies of such of the following Ages, as may be supposed to have been acquainted with it.

x Vindic. of the
Lords Prayer,
pag. 89.
y 1 Pet. i. 17.

The Learned *Meric Casaubon* x, where he insists upon the former of these, seems to himself to have found no improbable proof of this usage in those words of *St Peter* y. *And if ye call on the Father, or as he renders it, call upon him as Father, who, without respect of persons, judgeth according to every mans work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear.* I meddle not at present with that Allegation of his, because, what grounds soever there may be for that conjecture, yet they are not so clear to common understandings. Instead of that I shall insist upon a passage of our Saviour, which the more I consider of, the more am I confirmed in my belief of its being a proof of this Prayer having been used

used by his Disciples. *And, when ye stand praying, forgive 2, if ye have t* Mark 11.25
ought against any, that your father also which is in heaven may forgive you
your trespasses. That which induceth me so to think is first, this Speech
of his being uttered after *a* he had cast the Buyers and Sellers out of the
Temple, and so not only long after the delivery of this Prayer, in the
Mount, but after that second delivery of it, which is mentioned by
St. Luke b, as appears from the same *St. Luke's* recording that fact of his *b* Luke 11.2.
several Chapters c after it. By which observation thus much at least may *c* Luke 19. 45.
be gain'd, that the words I am now upon, if all other things answer,
may pass for an allusion to the Disciples use of the Lord's Prayer, be-
cause spoken long after the first and second delivery of it. All there-
fore that will be farther requisite to shew is, that those words of our
Saviour are an allusion to his own Prayer, and the Disciples use of it,
which yet will not be difficult to do; Partly, because there is mention
there both of the beginning of this Prayer, *Our Father which art in*
Heaven, and of one of the principal Petitions of it, even *forgive us our*
trespasses; and partly, because he supposeth his Disciples when they
prayed, to ask that particular Petition of their *Father which is in Hea-*
ven, yea to ask it of him upon condition of their own forgiveness of others,
as the same Prayer doth expressly direct: That, as it is not obscurely
insinuated by his prompting them to *forgive, if they had ought against*
any, because the most forcible reason he could give of that duty which
he exhorted them to, so the rather to be believed, because it is expressly
inserted in that Prayer, which he had before taught them, and by
which they were at least to frame their own. All which things who so-
ever shall consider, and compare with that Injunction of the Lords
Prayer which *St. Luke* presents us with, will I doubt not look upon
this passage as a probable proof of the Disciples use of it. For when
we find our Saviour, on the one hand, injoining *when ye pray, say, Our*
Father, and, on the other hand, those, to whom he said so, supposed
even by our Saviour himself, to use the same compellation when they
pray'd, and one of the most signal of its *Petitions*; what can be more
reasonable than to think, that they us'd the whole and every part of it,
and in those terms also wherein it was delivered by him: Sure I am there
can be nothing more agreeable to the design of our Saviours Discourse,
as will appear by this following Paraphrase of it: I have told you be-
fore, that *what things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive*
them, and ye shall have them. And I know nothing to hinder it, but
the evilness of your own hearts, and particularly your want of Charity
to others. But therefore I must also admonish you to remove that, as
well as the sin of infidelity, and accordingly, when you set your selves
to pray, to forgive your Brother, if you have ought against him; be-
cause, as I have oblig'd you, when you pray, to say *Our Father, &c.* so
I have there particularly directed you to pray *forgive us our trespasses,*
as we forgive them that trespass against us: Which therefore if ye have
not a charity correspondent to, you shall not only not be forgiven by
God, but incline him by his own Prayers to the denial of it.

From the Scriptures of the New Testament, pass we to the proofs of
the following Ages, and by which we shall not only be able to carry on
the story of this usance, but form a probable Argument from thence of
its having been the practice of the Apostles themselves. Of this nature
I reckon a saying of *Lucian*, and who is not only considerable for his
Antiquity

Antiquity, as who flourish'd in the time of that *Trajan*, to whose Reign *St. John* the Apostle did reach, but also for his being no Profelyte of our Religion, and whose knowledge therefore of this usance will make it so much the more notorious. Thus therefors he, after many other reproaches wherewith the Interlocutors of his *Philopatri*s endeavour to load Christianity, brings in one of them saying to the other, *Let these d alone, beginning the Prayer from the word Father, and adding in the close of it the song of many names.* For as, considering the drift of that *Dialogue*, we cannot well think any other than some Christian Prayer to be understood, so neither considering what he here saith concerning the beginning and the close of it, than that he meant that of our Lord and Saviour: That as it begins with *Father*, so concluding with a *doxology of many names*, whether thereby be meant that of *for thine is the Kingdom, the power, and the glory*, as *Mr. Gregory* hath interpreted it, or the known doxology to the Trinity, and wherewith we find it to have been sometime closed. To that of *Lucian* subjoyn we a passage of *Irenæus*, an Author of great esteem and no less Antiquity, as who flourished in the Reign of *Antonius* the *Philosopher*, and *Antoninus Verus*, and who affirms himself *g* to have seen and heard that *Polycarp* who was a Disciple of *St. John*. *Wherefore also*, saith he *h*, *The Lord hath taught us in Prayer to say, And forgive us our Debts, even because he is our Father whose Debtors we were, having transgressed his Commandments.* Words, which though in themselves not so clear and full for that purpose for which they are alledged, yet will be thought of force enough to evince it, if we can make it appear to have been that Father's Belief, that Christ enjoin'd upon us the use of that Prayer, which is here alluded to by him. For neither can he be thought to look upon that Prayer as injoin'd, but he must also be thought to have used it himself, yea that he believ'd it to have been so by those Apostles to whom it was delivered. That belief of his therefore is the thing, which we are to evidence from thence, and which the comparing of these words of his with the Injunction in *St. Luke* will sufficiently demonstrate. For when agreeably to our Saviours Injunction of saying, *Our Father, &c.* he affirms, that our Saviour taught us to say a particular Petition of it; when he not only repeats the very words of the Petition he referreth to, but also with that Particle *and*, wherewith it is connected to the other; what can be more reasonable than to think that his meaning was, that the Prayer it self was injoin'd upon us, as well as the subject matter of it? For beside that the word *say*, both in the *Evangelist* and *Irenæus*, cannot be so fairly interpreted of any other, than the reciting of those very words before which it is premis'd, and therefore not without very good reason to be drawn to another sense; there is this farther to hinder it, as to this pratical passage, even that those words, to which it is premis'd, are delivered under the same Form wherein they stand in the Prayer it self, and with that Particle which connects them to the other Petitions of it. Of which expression of *Irenæus* what more probable account can be given, than that he intended to say that Christ taught them to pray those very words of his, as well as to the same sense and effect? Because those words as they are Phras'd *and forgive us our debts*, agree not otherwise to the foregoing ones of *Irenæus*, than as they may be supposed to recite the very words themselves, and consequently oblige us by the Doctrine of Christ to the using of them.

But

^d ὁ ἱεὺς
τῶν
χρὶς ἀπὸ πα-
τρὸς ἐξ ἑαυ-
τοῦ, καὶ τὴν
πρῶτον οὐρανὸν
ᾧ ὁὖν ἐστὶν τὸ
ἀπὸ ἑαυτοῦ.
Lucian in Phi-
lopatr.
e Nor. & Obf.
in loca aliquot
Script. c. 38.
f Vid Ambros.
li. 6. de Sa-
cram. cap. ult.

g Epist. ad Flo-
rin. citat. ab
Euseb. Eccl.
Hist. l. 5. c. 20.
h Irenæ. adv.
heres. l. 5. c. 17.
Quapropter &
in oratione di-
cere nos docuit,
Et remitte nobis
debita nostra,
utiq; quoniam
hic est Pater
noster, cuius e-
ramus debitores
transgressi ejus
præceptum.

But of all the proofs which Antiquity affords us of the use of this Prayer in the Christian Church, yea up to the times of the Apostles, there is certainly none more full and cogent, than that which I am now to subjoin, even the Declaration of *Tertullian* concerning it. For after that that Father had said, that the Religion of this Prayer being ordained by God, and animated by his breath, even then when it proceeded out of his divine mouth, ascendeth by its own privilege into Heaven commending unto the Father what things the Son had taught, he subjoineth thereupon, *Tet because the Lord, who both foreseeth and provideth for human necessities, did after this Prayer of his, and apart from it, say, Ask and ye shall receive, and there are things to be ask'd according to every mans particular circumstances, therefore the prescribed and ordinary Prayer being premis'd as the foundation, there is leave to superstruct upon it such occasional Petitions as our external circumstances shall suggest.* What force there is in this testimony of *Tertullian* is not difficult to discern, but I shall however, for the importance of the thing in question, endeavour to add farther light to it: Offering first of all to consideration, his affirming the Religion of this Prayer to have been ordained by God, or rather by his Son; his representing it as a Prayer prescribed by the Christian Law (for so I translate the word *legitima*, as that too not only from the force of the word it self, but from what he adds concerning the right of offering up other Prayers beside that, and of which there could have been no question at all if that Prayer had not been it self prescribed) in fine, his making that Prayer the foundation of all the rest, and upon which they ought to be superstructed: For this shews that Father to have look'd upon it as prescribed by Christ as a Form, and consequently to have thought also that it was made use of by his Apostles, and all other his obedient Servants. I observe secondly, that as *Tertullian* represents this Prayer as prescribed, so he represents it also as an ordinary one, that is to say, as I should think, as a Prayer of general and constant use, and accordingly so used by those at least of his own time: That, as it is the most easy and natural interpretation of the word *ordinary*, so standing yet more confirm'd by his intimating it to be so far prescrib'd, that there could be no place for other Prayers, where that did not precede. For neither can we think, but that, if the practice of the Church had been any way dissonant to it, so severe a man as *Tertullian* would, upon this occasion, have remark'd and censur'd it, as we find him apt enough to do even in matters of far less consequence. It is to be observed thirdly, that as the Testimony of *Tertullian* is express and clear for the ordinary use of this Prayer in that Age wherein he liv'd, so it is no improbable Argument of its having been of greater Antiquity, and so not far remov'd from an Apostolical one: As will appear if we consider in what Age that Author flourish'd, and the distance thereof from that of the Apostles. For *Tertullian* flourishing in the year of our Lord 200, and so not above 100 years after the death of St *John*, which was the end of the Apostolical Age; it will follow by this testimony of his, that within that space of time the use of the Lords Prayer was ordinary in the Church. Which, if it do not evince it to have been of Apostolical Antiquity, yet will shew it to have been very near it, in as much as what was then of ordinary use, cannot be presum'd to have been without some footsteps at least in the foregoing times, and so not far remov'd even from the Apostolical ones: Things

Ab ipso igitur ordinata religio Orationis, & de spiritu ipsius, jam tunc cum ex ore divino ferretur, animata suo privilegio ascendit in calum commendans patri quae filius docuit. Quoniam tamen Dominus prospector humanarum necessitatum, seorsum post traditionem orandi disciplinam, Peti-re, inquit, & accipietis; & sunt quae prestantur pro circumstantia cujusque; praemissa legitima & ordinaria oratione, quasi fundamento, accidentium jus est desideriorum, jus est superstruendi extrinsecus petitiones. De Oratione, c. 9.

of general use becoming not such all of a sudden, and therefore of necessity pointing us to a higher original of them. It is to be observed lastly, that though the testimony of *Tertullian* might have been rendered questionable by the either silence, or else clearness of former Writers, if they had had the same, or as weighty an occasion to speak of the subject matter of it; Yet the like is not to be said against it, if they had not the same, or as weighty an occasion to deliver their opinion concerning it. Which that they had not, is evident from hence, that none of them before himself entreated *de industria* concerning the Lord's Prayer, or at least none of those who are come unto our hands, which is all one in the present case. Now as if none before him did ever so entreat of the Lords Prayer, neither could any of them be expected to deliver themselves with the same clearness concerning its being enjoined as a Form, or the Churches use of it as such; so we are by no means therefore to detract from the testimony of *Tertullian* for their either silence, or less clearness. On the contrary, that testimony of his may be thought to add not a little force to those indications we have of it in the other. For inasmuch as one who was so near to them, where he wrote *de industria* concerning the Lord's Prayer, did so clearly assert its being both enjoined and used as a Form; it is not improbable from that assertion of his, and the indications they themselves have given of it, that the other look'd upon it as such, and would accordingly have delivered it with the same clearness that *Tertullian* did, if they had had the like incitement to it.

IV. Having thus shewn what Authority there is for the use of the Lord's Prayer, as well from the practise of the Churches as from the Injunction of him who was the Author of it, my proposed method obligeth me to enquire *what place it leaveth to other Prayers, or to us for the presenting of them.* The ground of which question is not, as some have vainly deem'd, our Saviour's commanding when we pray to say, *Our Father,* (for that doth not so much exclude other Prayers as enjoin the use of this) but the perfection that must be acknowledged to be in it. And certainly were we under a necessity to keep our selves to those generalities, to which the Prayer of our Lord confines it self, that question would not admit of a satisfactory answer, and we should not only find our selves obliged to the use of the Lord's Prayer, but to the use of no other beside it. For by adding to it the like Prayers of our own, we should but detract from its worth, because intimating thereby the insufficiency thereof. But as it is no prejudice to the perfection of that, to add thereto more particular Petitions because the Lord's Prayer pretends not to descend to those; so I shall shew both from Scripture and reason the Authority there is for such Petitions, as are more suitable to our particular concerns. I alledge for the former of these our Saviour's obliging his Disciples, even after the delivery of this Prayer, to ask that they might have, yea to ask (for so our Saviour doth afterwards himself interpret himself) *the gift of the holy Spirit,* and which though included in the Petitions of the Lord's Prayer, yet hath no particular mention there; His obliging the Jewish Women after that, in consideration of what he had foretold concerning the destruction of *Jerusalem*, to pray in particular that their *flight* from it might not be in the Winter, or on the Sabbath, as all of them, who should live to those times, that they should watch and pray always, that they might be accounted worthy to escape

h Luke 11. 9.
l ---- 13.

m Mat. 24. 20.

escape all those things that should come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man. For these and other the like Injunctions shew plainly, that there is place for such Petitions as are more agreeable to our particular circumstances, and therefore also for other Prayers beside our Saviours. Agreeable hereto is both the practice and precept of his Apostles, that we may not any longer doubt of the place there is for other Prayers. For we find even them, when they met to chuse an Apostle in the stead of Judas, praying God to shew which he himself had chosen of those two o whom they had nominated, as, after that, when they had been convened and threatned by the Rulers of the Jews, praying unto God in like manner, that he would behold those Rulers threatnings, and grant unto them notwithstanding to speak his word with all boldness. In fine, thus we find St Paul (that I may not any longer insist upon a thing so plain) making frequent mention of the particular Prayers he put up for those whom he wrote to, as on the other side obliging them to pray in particular for himself, and other his fellow Labourers, for all men whatsoever, and in special for Kings; in short for all those particular boons which he supposed to be most suitable to the exigency of their conditions or his own. There being therefore no doubt, as to the Scripture, of the either lawfulness or necessity of more particular Petitions, than the Lords Prayer prompts us to present, enquire we in the next place what ground there is for them from reason, and so much the rather, because, how lawful soever they may be in themselves, yet if they be represented upon ill grounds, (as they are like enough to be) they may be both irrational and impious. For such no doubt it would be to represent them with a design of giving God a more exact information of our necessities, or the means by which they may be supplied: This, as hath been elsewhere observ'd, being rather to defame, than honour him, because derogatory to that infinite knowledge wherewith he is endu'd. But as therefore we are to avoid the presenting any particular requests upon that score, as which is the way rather to ruine than to procure the acceptation of them; so the ground of all Prayers, in respect of God, being to acknowledge our dependance upon him, the ground of more particular ones must consequently be, the giving him so much the fuller acknowledgment of that dependance, and to which indeed they do signally minister. For thus, for instance, though he who begs of God all thing necessary for his body, doth by that Prayer of his declare his dependance upon him as to each particular one, yet doth he not do it with that fullness, wherewith that man acknowledgeth it, who proceeds, as occasion offers, to the mention of particular ones: Because though every general Petition include in it all the particulars of the same kind, yet it doth it after a rude and imperfect manner, and by which therefore the mind of man can neither attain a due knowledge of those several particulars which it begs, nor consequently make so full an acknowledgment of its own dependance upon God for them. Not less ground is there from reason as to a particular mention of some of those persons for whom we are bound to pray, as well as of those blessings we are taught to ask, either for our selves or them. For the principal ground of Praying for other men being that whether love, or esteem, or gratitude, which is owing by us to them; where we are under a more particular obligation to either of these, there consequently we must be equally oblig'd to be as particular

o Act. i. 24.

p. 4. 29.

q Disc. 2. of: his
Introd.

in imploring the mercy of God on their behalf. From all which as it appears that there is place for such Petitions as are suited to our particular circumstances ; so that the use of the Lord's Prayer doth not therefore supersede the presenting of them, because confining it self to general ones. Only as those general ones are no doubt the rule of all particulars, because containing all particulars in them ; so it is not the least design of the ensuing Treatise to teach men how to deduce those particulars from them, and accordingly present God not with *other*, or *contrary* Petitions, but with the *same* that are here suggested, only accommodated to their particular concerns.

V. There being therefore (as hath been shewn at large) place for other Prayers beside this, according to mens particular circumstances enquire we in the next place (because the Adversaries of our Church will have it so) whether there be not *place also for the digesting them into the like set forms of Prayer* ; or rather *whether this Prayer of our Lord doth not give sufficient Authority to them, and particularly to such set Forms of Prayer, as are fram'd by publick Authority for the service of the publick Assemblies*. In order whereunto I will enquire *first*, whether this Prayer do not give sufficient warrant to the use of set forms of Prayer, and *secondly*, if it do, whether it do not also give the Church the like Authority to frame such set Forms of Prayer for the publick Assemblies and impose the use of them upon the respective members of it.

I. The ground of the former of these, is that difference which seems to be between the matter of the Lord's Prayer, and that of those which we superadd to it. For though, if the matter of our own Prayers might be equally digested into set Forms, no doubt at all could be made of the warrantableness of the use of them upon the Authority of our Saviours both example and prescription ; yet the like is not to be said, if the matter of our own Prayers will not equally bear it, and which the account I have before given of it may seem to perswade. For whereas the matter of the Lords Prayer is only general Petitions, and which by reason of the invariableness thereof may well be digested into a set Form of words ; the matter of our own Prayers, on the other side, is such Petitions especially as are more agreeable to our particular circumstances, and which, because of a more variable nature, may well be thought to give the like variety to those Petitions, which are to be fram'd after their example. If therefore we will shew the warrantableness of other set Forms of Prayer, upon the score of that of our Saviour, that disparity which seems to be between the matter of them must of necessity be remov'd, and which therefore I shall set my self to the doing of.

But here again we must premise a distinction, and which, if well attended to, well serve as a clue to lead us out of all this difficulty. For those particular circumstances whereof I speak, and which I but now affirm'd to be the grounds of men's particular Prayers, are either *standing and ordinary*, or *contingent and extraordinary*. If question be made concerning the latter of these, so I readily grant that no set Form of Prayer can make provision for them by reason of the uncertainty thereof: But I must say withal, that as no Asserter of set Forms did ever affirm they could, so our own Church, notwithstanding its Liturgy, doth, as occasion invites, direct the composing of such Forms of Prayer as may be more agreeable to them. But as it is one thing to say,

say, that no set Form of Prayer can provide for such circumstances as are contingent and extraordinary, and another, that no set Form can provide for standing and ordinary ones; so no doubt at all can be made but that set Forms may provide for the latter of these, as well as for more general concerns. If therefore there be any thing to impeach the credit of set Forms, it must be either that the main of mens particular circumstances are not standing and ordinary, or if they be, yet that it is not enough to provide for those.

Now that the main of mens particular circumstances are standing and ordinary, and for which consequently provision may be made by a set Form of Prayer, will appear if we consider them, either singly or collectively, in their own proper persons, or as they are combin'd into a Church or Nation. If we consider men singly and in their own proper persons, so the main of their particular circumstances will be found to be standing and ordinary, because determin'd for the main by that which is of as uniform a nature, even their proper inclinations, or that course of life which they pursue. I instance first for the proof hereof in mens particular errors, and which it must be confess'd they are under as particular an obligation to pray against, or beg of God the pardon of. For though those may be sometime varied by unusual accidents and temptations, and consequently may make it so much the more difficult to provide a set Form to suit them; yet in as much as they are generally fram'd by mens proper inclinations, or that course of life which they pursue, they will be found for the most part to be of one uniform tenour, and which therefore a set Form of Prayer may furnish suitable expressions to beg the averting of, or God's pardon and forgiveness of them. In like manner, though there may arise, as to our temporal welfare, some extraordinary accidents, which may either promote or obstruct it, yet in as much as we generally pursue it by some uniform course of life, and wherein therefore we shall for the most part meet with the same furtherances or hinderances, it will not be difficult for us to foresee what those furtherances or hinderances may be, and accordingly, so far as may be expedient, to provide our selves of such a set Form, as may beg the granting of the one, or the preventing or removal of the other. This therefore being the case of particular men and their circumstances, and so admitting of a provision by a set Form of Prayer, let us again consider the same men, as embodied into a Church or Nation, and for which we know our own Church to have thought it no improbable course to provide by a Form of the like nature. What other exceptions have been made against it is not my business to enquire, neither would it be worth the while after the labours of the Judicious *Hooker*, whose solid defence thereof hath continued unanswer'd to this day. It may suffice me to make it appear, that it hath not pretended without reason to provide for the particular circumstances thereof, and of the several Congregations in it. * For so I shall at the same time shew, that the necessities of so great a body as a Church or Nation may be provided for by a set Form, which is that I am at present to demonstrate. Now there are two things which are requisite to be prov'd, in order to the evincing of the Conclusion that is now before us; first, that our *Liturgy* provides sufficiently for the particular circumstances of the Church considered in the gross, and as it is a Society or Body; secondly, that it provides as much for the particular

lar circumstances of the respective members of it, as can be thought to be requisite in the publick Offices of the Church. As to the former of these much need not to be said, because of the particular Prayers it makes for all States and Orders of men in the Church, and of which the *Litany* it self is an abundant evidence. For making such a particular enumeration of the several Orders and States of men in the Church and putting up such pithy and apt supplications for them, it must of necessity be thought to have provided so far for the necessities of the Church in its more publick and general capacity. If there be any doubt of the sufficiency of its provision it must be as to the provision it makes for the particular circumstances of the several members of it, so far as can be thought requisite in the publick Offices of the Church, which yet upon due consideration will easily vanish. As will appear, if we reflect upon the sins of those members, and which, if any thing, may seem to require a particular confession of, and as particular a deprecation against. For considering how impossible it is for him, who is the mouth of the Congregation, to know the particular errors of the several members of it, or to make an enumeration of them, though he could; considering farther how apt men are, even in the confession of sin, to favour their own party, and so present God with a confession of other mens sins, rather than of their own; considering lastly, how apt men are either to misinterpret, or miscall the actions of those who differ from them, and consequently thereto, to present the Congregation rather with a Libel against a part of it, than with a Confession that is futable to the whole; It cannot but be thought to be the most proper course to have such a Confession fram'd, as may seem not so much to particularize mens errors, as to lead them by fair hints to the acknowledgment of them themselves. Because as by this means a particular Confession will be provided for, so without any of the other inconveniences thereof. I am yet more confirm'd in this opinion by the nature of publick Prayer, and which being no other than the agreeing ^r Votes and acknowledgments of those that join in it, cannot better be provided for, than by so framing each part thereof, that all they, who join in them, may say *Amen* to them as to their own particulars. For if so, those general hints, whereof I speak, will better serve the ends of publick Prayer, than a more particular enumeration of offences, because the former, by reason of the generality thereof, may at the same time fit the mouths of all, and yet lead them to reflect upon, and acknowledge their particular offences. All therefore that will be farther requisite to shew, is, that that *Liturgy*, whereof we speak, hath offered men such fair hints for the reflecting upon, and acknowledging the particular errors they have been guilty of. Which that it hath, will need no other proof, than its making the *ten Commandments*, and that short Collect which is subjoin'd to each of them, a part of its Service. For those *Commandments* containing in them the general heads of our obedience, or disobedience, and moreover being drawn down to particulars by the known *Catechism* of our Church, and which all men whatsoever either are, or may be acquainted with; It cannot be, but that, whilst men are thus prompted to a particular consideration of them, they should thereby be stirred up to as particular a reflection upon their own sins, and consequently to bestow a particular *Lord have mercy* upon themselves with regard to those sins, and the desire of the divine grace

to Preserve them from them for the future, and incline them to the contrary vertues.

But because it may be said, that however set Forms of Prayer may provide for the *standing and ordinary* circumstances of single persons, and Churches, yet they are not affirmed by our selves to be of the like *sutableness* to provide for *contingent and extraordinary* ones; and, because it may also be said that we are under an obligation to provide for the latter, as well as the former, and so far forth a necessity of departing from those set Forms whereof I speak; I answer first, that though that be true, yet it makes nothing against those by whom set Forms are recommended to the World: Because they are so far from making set Forms to answer those, that, as occasion invites, they themselves compose and recommend the use of others, which are more *sutable* to those extraordinary ones. I say secondly, that as the Champions of set Forms do not prejudge the use of others in contingent and extraordinary circumstances, so nothing hinders, as to the thing it self, but that men may make use of the latter as well as of the former, yea of the latter together with the former; Of the former so far as mens *standing and ordinary* circumstances do require, of the latter so far as they are invited to it by extraordinary ones. I say thirdly, that as there is no prescription at all by our Church to mens private Prayers, and not the least hinderance therefore, from it, as to their adding such Petitions to their usual ones, as emergent cases seem to them to require; so it is the known and allowed practice of our Church, upon all publick and extraordinary occasions, to provide *sutable* Prayers for them, and so far therefore no fear at all of their being neglected by us. If there be any scruple as to this affair, it must be as to less publick ones, but which yet may seem to us to be worthy of our notice in those respective places wherein we live. But as there want not even in our Liturgy, *it self special* Forms of Prayer and *Thanksgiving*, and which may perhaps be very well adapted to those circumstances whereof we speak: so the usual Prayers before and after Sermon may supply greater defects than those, without at all justling out the Liturgy of the Church.

[At the end of the Litany.]

2. Such warrant there is from the Lord's Prayer for the use of other the like set Forms, even those which are design'd for more particular circumstances; it remains only, that I shew that it gives the Church the like Authority to frame such set Forms for the publick Assemblies, and impose the use of them upon the respective members of it. But as there can be as little doubt of that, considering our Saviours prescription of this, if it appear to be for the benefit of the Church; because it is certain, that he delegated so much at least of his own Authority to the Church, as might serve for the better edification of it: So, so much hath been said of late days for the usefulness of such set Forms, that I shall forbear any formal proof of it. Instead of that I shall content my self with the words of Mr Calvin, and which the many known misadventures of those, who would use no Prayers but those of their own framing, will give sufficient Authority to. *As touching the Form of Prayers and Ceremonies in the Church, I approve very much that it be set, and that it be not lawful for the Pastors to recede from it in their function; as well to help the simplicity and unskilfulness of some, as that the consent of all* *ceat, tam ut consularur quorundam simplicitati & imperitiæ, quam ut certius ita constet omnium inter se Ecclesiarum consensus, postremo etiam ut obviam eatur desultoriæ quorundam levitati, qui novationes quasdam affectant.* Calv. Epist. ad Pro-

*Quod ad formam precum & rituum Ecclesiarum, valde probe ut certa illa exstet, a qua Pastoribus discedere infuncti-
one sua non liceat.*

Churches

u 1 Cor. 14:32.

* Dr Taylor's
Apology for
Authorized
and set Forms
of Liturgy.

Churches among themselves may thereby the more certainly appear; lastly also that a stop may be put to the desultory lightness of some men, who are fond of certain novelties. So little consideration was then had of that gift of Prayer which hath since been talk'd of, or the hinderance that a *Liturgy* might be to the exercise thereof; whether they thought that there was then no such peculiar gift, or that they had learn'd from St Paul u, that, whatsoever gift there might be of that nature, *the spirits of the Prophets* ought to be *subjected to the Prophets*, and to the common edification of the Church. For my part, as I could never yet see why those Abilities, which fit a man for the composing of Prayers, may not fit him alike for other services in the Church, and accordingly, if so employ'd, hinder him from being *idle and unedifying*, which is the charitable censure that hath been put upon those, who contented themselves with the Churches Prayers; So can I as little see, why, if there be really any such distinct gift, it may not be profitably employ'd, yea though the use of the *Liturgy* should continue in force: Because (as a Learned * man did long since observe) there may be place for the exercise thereof in composing, for other orders of men, such Prayers and Thanksgivings, as may serve for the actuating of their private Devotions, upon all ordinary and extraordinary occurrences.

AN

A N
EXPLICATION
OF THE
LORDS PRAYER,
As it is a Part of, and Interpreted
BY THE
CATECHISM
OF THE
CHURCH
OF
E N G L A N D.

AN
EXPLANATION
OF THE
LORDS PRAYER
As it is a Part of, and Interpreted
BY THE
CATECHISM
OF THE
CHURCH
OF
ENGLAND.

AN
EXPLICATION
OF THE
LORDS PRAYER,

As it is a Part of, and Interpreted by

THE
CATECHISM
OF THE
CHURCH
OF
ENGLAND.

**Our Father which art in
Heaven.**

The CONTENTS.

Of the title of him to whom the Lords Prayer is directed, and why it begins with that title. Enquiry next made who is intended by that title, which is shewn to be God, and God the Father. The consistency of this last assertion with the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the right each person thereof hath to the Tribute of our Prayers. A more particular consideration of the title it self, and enquiry thereupon made, what is the meaning of those appellations whereof it is made up, and what are the reasons of our use of them. That we ought to understand by Father, him who is so by adoption and providence, as well as by creation and grace, and evidence

made of each of those senses of it, and of the reasons of our use of it, which are shewn to be, on the part of God, to make an acknowledgment thereby of his Paternity, and our dependance upon it, and as to our selves, for an encouragement of our addresses. The explication of the word *Father*, concluded with a more particular account of the Particle *Our*, which is added to it, and the reason of superadding it to the other. What we ought to understand by the words which art in Heaven, and the reason of our use of them.

IF being agreed upon, on the one hand, that that Prayer, which I am now to explain, was intended as a pattern to all Christian ones; and it being as apparent, on the other, that it must therefore be as comprehensive in its sense, as it seems to be defective in words: it cannot but be thought a labour well bestow'd, to investigate the due sense of every Particle thereof. That so men may as well know, how to model their own Prayers, as attain a general understanding of this. Till therefore from out those many Learned men, wherewith the Church of England is stor'd, some one shall arise who is better qualified for it, I hope it will not be unacceptable to the World, that I attempt such an Explication of it, and offer it, if not to the more knowing part thereof, yet at least to the consideration of those, who cannot furnish themselves with an exacter one.

Now as that which comes first of all to be explain'd is the *title* of him to whom this Prayer is directed, so I know not what more can be done toward the unfolding of it, than to enquire,

I. Why it begins with the *title* of him, to whom it is directed?

II. Who it is, that is intended by that *title*?

III. What is the meaning of those several appellations wherof that *title* is made up, and what are the reasons of our use of them?

I. The ground of the first of these, is that apparent difference there is between the addresses which are made to men, and those that are made to God. For though it be natural for men, when they speak to one of their own frame, to call him by his name or title, yet is that either to let him know, that it is to him to whom they speak, or to awake him by the mention of his name to listen more attentively to it, Neither the one, nor the other of which can be assur'd of him, to whom (as I shall afterwards shew) this Prayer of our Saviour is directed; because God is not of so scant a knowledge as not to know when we speak to him, nor of so drowsy an attention, as to need to be awaken'd to it. But as therefore we can find nothing in God to oblige us to begin our Prayers to him with the mention of his name or title; so we must consequently make the ground thereof to be the need we our selves stand in of it, and as it may be suppos'd to be an *item* to us, before whom we present our selves, and accordingly to carry our selves during our continuance in it. Which particular yet I should not have been so forward to observe, were it not, I do not say for the grossness of the vulgar sort, but because of the aptness of us all to think of God as of our selves, and accordingly to converse with him even in Prayer. By which means we may become guilty of a double error, because dishonouring God by those very acts, which were intended for the worship of him.

II. That first query being thus dispatch'd, pass we to a second, and which

which indeed is a more material one; that I mean which pretends to enquire, who it is that is intended in that title which is now under consideration. Where first I shall shew that it is *God*, who is intended under it, and secondly, that it is no other than *God the Father*.

I. And here not to alledge for the former of these, the language of the Jews, and in which the title of *Our Father which is in Heaven*, is an *antifal*, *periphrasis* of *God*; nor yet, which is more material, the account which our Saviour gives us of it immediately before the delivery of this his Prayer, as that *that Father of ours*, which is in Heaven, *couseth his Sun to rise*, and *b his rain to fall upon good and bad*, and that he *seeth our secret Prayers*, and *alms* ^c; as well as *open ones*, which can be understood of no other than *God*; I will content my self with that evidence which this Prayer of his will afford us, and almost every particular of it. For what *Father* can we be suppos'd to have in *Heaven* but *God*, from whom besides him to draw our original, or promise our selves a paternal care? Whose *name* and *Kingdom* can we so absolutely define the glorification of, whose *will* but his can be thought to prevail both in the upper and lower World? In fine, from whom, but him, can we be suppos'd to receive *forgiveness of sins*, expect to be preserved from *temptation*, or to be delivered from the evil of it? It being certain, that he, and he alone, doth whatsoever he will ^d both in *Heaven* and *Earth*, and from whom alone therefore such boons as these can be reasonably either desired, or expected. And yet, as certain as this may seem to be, and consequently the necessity of directing such like Petitions unto *God*, there have not wanted those who would remit us for them to others, yea make this very Prayer of our Lord to be no improper address unto them. Witness that we are told by the *Archbishop of St. Andrewse*, and which, if it had been in a less serious business, would have ministred matter for dispute. "For when one *Stephen Marshall*, Prior of the *Black-Friars* at *Newcastle* in *England*, had in a Sermon of his at *St. Andrews* in *Scotland*, taken the boldness to affirm that the *Pater noster* should be said to *God* only, and not unto the *Saints*, he was not only encountered by several Doctors of that University, and particularly by a bold and ignorant Friar whom they set up to confute him, but a Convention of the Doctors indicted thereupon, and wherein, though with several distinctions, the contrary was concluded upon. Though, as they did not agree upon their distinctions, it was at length referred to a Provincial Synod, and wherein it was carried by Voices that the *Pater noster* might be said unto the *Saints*, though the *Bishops*, and some others of judgment, would not suffer it to be enacted: They contenting themselves to say and teach (which was all they had the hardiness to speak out) that the *Pater Noster* ought to be said to *God*, yet so that the *Saints* ought also to be invocated, and, I suppose, in the same Prayer. I presume they of *Rome* will not easily allow of such assertions now, because, though they have not it may be departed at all from their wonted tenets, yet Christian Ears will hardly digest the putting up the Lords Prayer to any other than *God*; But that some of its prime Petitions, and particularly those that beg for grace and pardon are allowed to this very day to their respective *Saints*, he, that shall peruse some of our late Authors, and particularly *Dr. Scillingfleet*, may easily satisfy himself. Only as there is nothing so bad which may not admit of a defence

^a Cappell. in Mat. 6 9.

^b — 5. 45.
^c — 6. 4. 6.

^d Psal. 135. 6.

^e History of the Church of Scotland. li. 2. p. 91, 92.

^f Of the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome, c. 2. p. 162. 176.

g Explicat. of
the Decal.
Command. 1.
Part. 7.

fence, or at least of some colourable excuse; so it is not to be dem'd, that the present Age hath found out certain distinctions to elude, if possible, the force of so criminal a charge. But as they, who shall more nearly consider them, will find all those distinctions to be vain, and to shew rather a willingness to shake off the charge, than a belief, even in themselves, concerning the warrantableness of their practice; so I have elsewhere^g considered all that is alledged by them, and shall therefore refer my Reader thither for his farther satisfaction in it. All I aim at at present, is to shew, even from this Prayer of our Lord, how inconsistent such addressees as those are with truly Christian Prayers, and such as we are now obliged to put up. For if all our Prayers are to be modelled by that which is now under consideration, and more especially, as to those things which it particularly professeth to direct, then are they all to be directed to our Father which is in Heaven, because that, which ought to be their pattern, is so. Otherwise, we shall not pray after the same manner which Christ hath taught us, which yet I have before shewn we are obliged to, even by the express command of the Author of it.

2. But because in the Godhead there are no less than three persons, and question may therefore be made, whether this Prayer were directed to all those, or if not, to which of them in particular; therefore to satisfy our selves yet farther as to the person here intended, we must make that also the matter of our enquiry, and address our selves to the solution of it. On the one side it may seem, that the whole Trinity ought to be understood, because as each person thereof is really God; and consequently to be pray'd to, so this Prayer will hardly pass for a perfect pattern unto ours, if it make not a suitable provision for each of them. And to this I sometime thought that of *Tertullian* might allude, where, explaining the word *Father*, he tells us *b* that *the Son is also invoked in the Father, because that Son himself hath said, that he and the Father were one*. But as I shall by and by shew, that that Authors words may have another sense, and such as doth more agree with our understanding the *Father* here spoken of to be no other than the first person in the Trinity; so there are many things that perswade the so understanding of it, or rather oblige us to it. Of this nature I reckon first, and chiefly, our Saviour's representing that *Father which is in Heaven*, as *his Father* as well as *ours*, yea doing so in that very Sermonⁱ, where this Prayer of his was first delivered, and where there is frequent mention of this particular title. For as we cannot reasonably think, unless our Saviour had any where made a distinction, but that we are to understand all along one and the same person under the title of *our Father which is in Heaven*; so we can much less, after this allegation, think any other to be intended, than him who is the first person in the Trinity: Because as it is certain, that he is his Father as to his divine nature, yea the only one; so we find the Son himself to own, that he had prepared him *k* a body, and consequently also, that the same person was the Father of his humane one. Not (as hath been elsewhere observ'd) but that the Holy Ghost also had an interest in this latter birth, and so in like manner in this paternity, but that he acted therein as the *power of the highest l*, and so that paternity to be much more properly ascrib'd to him, whose *power* and *spirit* he was. However, it is no where affirm'd, that our Saviour was the Father of himself, either as to his di-

*b Tertull. de Or-
ratione, c. 2.
Item in patre
filius invocatur.
Ego enim,
inquis, & pater
unum sumus.*

i Mat. 7. 21.

k Heb. 10. 5.

l Luke 1. 35.

vine,

vire, or humane nature, which yet must be affirmed here, if we make that *Father which is in Heaven* to be the whole undivided Trinity. It is to be observed secondly, that as our Saviour represented the Father here spoken of, as his Father as well as ours, and so gave a sufficient proof of his understanding thereby no other than the first person in the Trinity; so we find the Apostles for the most part directing their Prayers to him, and so confirming yet farther that interpretation of it: Witness, (to omit others) those testimonies which the single Epistle to the Ephesians will furnish us withal, and which may serve for a *δῆξις* of the rest. For there we find St. Paul making mention of his own blessing God and the Father *m* for his blessing them with all spiritual blessings in *m* Eph. 1. 3. Christ, of his praying that the God *n* of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father *n* — 17. of glory, would give unto them the spirit of wisdom and revelation, of his bowing his knee to the Father *o* of our Lord Jesus Christ, as in fine (in *o* — 3. 14. agreement to his own practice) admonishing others in like manner to give thanks always for all things unto God *p* and the Father, in the name *p* Eph. 5. 20. of our Lord Jesus Christ. For though no doubt can be made even of his supplicating the Son also, as may appear from his wishing those Ephesians grace from the Lord Jesus Christ *q*, as well as from God and our *q* — 1. 2: Father: yet as that title of God and our Father, is a farther argument of the same persons being our and Christ's Father, and, consequently, of the reasonableness of our understanding the first person of the Trinity to be the person design'd by our Father which is in Heaven; so the places before-mentioned make it evident, that the Prayers of the Apostles were for the most part directed to him, and consequently make it yet more reasonable to understand him to be the Father, to whom we are here prompted to address our selves. I observe thirdly, that as the Apostles did for the most part direct their Prayers unto the Father, after the pattern of that Prayer which was enjoind upon them by our Saviour; so there may seem to have been a particular reason for it, in regard of that pre-eminence which is due unto the Father, as he is the Fountain and Root of the Deity, and the *πρωτογενῆς τῆς γεννίας* of all our happiness. For though the Son and the Holy Ghost partake alike of the divine nature, and consequently have a right to the same adoration, yet in as much as it is the Father who communicates that divine nature to them both, this prerogative cannot but be thought to belong to him, as not only never to be forgotten by us in our addresses, but to be so far in special remembred by us, as shall be found to be consistent with the acknowledgment of the equal Divinity of the rest. Which may very well be done, if, after an address unto the Father, (and to whom (as I said) it may most properly be directed as being the Fountain of the Deity, and the *πρωτογενῆς τῆς γεννίας* of all our happiness) we conclude all with a general Doxology to those other persons of the Trinity, who are partakers with him of the divine nature. And indeed as this, generally speaking, hath ever been the mode of Christian Prayers, and which therefore will make what I but now said, so much the more easy to be digested; so we find by St. Ambrose in the place but now *r* quoted, that they were wont in his days to conclude the Lord's Prayer it self with these words, *through our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom, and with whom, there belongs to thee honour and praise, together with the Holy Ghost.* Which, by the way, is a farther argument, that the Church in his time, understood no other, by our Father which is in Heaven, than the first person

f Explicat. of
the Apostles
Creed. Upon
the words, *The
Father, and
His only Son.*

person in the Trinity. I say fourthly, that though; (as I have elsewhere observed) the Doctrine of the Trinity was, as to the substance of it, no stranger to the Old Testament, and may therefore be thought to have furnished sufficient intimations to those, that were under it, of praying to the respective persons of it: Yet in as much as that Doctrine was but obscurely delivered in the Old Testament, and, when this Prayer was first given, not as yet cleared by the New; in as much as those Disciples therefore, to whom this Prayer was given, could not be suppos'd to have any distinct conception of it, and much less so distinct a one, as to enable them to offer up their Prayers to the respective persons of it; in as much, lastly, as it doth not appear, that those Jews of whom the Disciples were, made their Prayers to any other than the God and Father of the Messiah and us; neither can we think, that, when our Saviour dictated to them the present Prayer, he meant any other by *Our Father which art in Heaven* than the *Father* of the *Messiah* and *us*, or prompted the Disciples at that time to address themselves unto: Partly because they had not been acquainted with praying to any other, and could not therefore of themselves apprehend him to intend any such thing: and partly because he himself had not so far clear'd that Doctrine of the Trinity to them, as to enable them to pay their Devotions to the respective persons of it. I conclude therefore, that, by *our Father which is in Heaven*, we are not to understand the whole Trinity, but the first person of it, and to whom the Scripture gives the title of *Father of Christ* and *us*. But because it may be enquir'd, how (supposing as was before affirm'd) this Prayer can be thought to provide for the honour of the other two, and so be a perfect pattern unto ours, therefore, for the farther clearing of that which is now under consideration, address we our selves to the solution of it, though if we attend more carefully to it, and particularly to the words of *Tertullian* before-mentioned, that difficulty will presently vanish. For neither first, (as was before observ'd) is there any necessity of such a particular invocation of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*, as there appears to be of the *Father*. On the contrary I have shewn it to be enough, that we conclude our invocations of the *Father* with such a *Doxology*, as may evince our having regard unto the other. If it be yet farther objected, that, though there be no necessity of so particular an invocation of the other two, yet by the Doctrine of Christianity and our own intimation, there ought to be some kind of acknowledgment of them, which yet seems not here to be provided for; I answer secondly, that such an acknowledgment ought indeed to be provided for, but I see no reason to grant, that it ought to be provided for in express terms: Because that Prayer, which ought to provide for it, being but a general one, and so proposing only a gross and general instruction of us, it may very well be thought to have satisfied its end, if it do only imply that acknowledgment whereof we speak. Which that it doth, will appear if we consider that which induced *Tertullian* to affirm, *That we invoke the Son in the Father*. For if (as that *Father* goes on) the *Father* and the *Son* are one in essence, yea, the whole three persons are; he, who prays to the *Father* as God, must own, though indirectly, an obligation to the other two, because one in essence with him. If it be yet farther repli'd, that Christianity requires of us a more direct acknowledgment of the other two persons, as appears from its baptizing us into the name of each

of them; I answer, that Christianity doth indeed require such an acknowledgement, but that it did not require any such, till the Doctrine of that Trinity, whereupon it was built, was cleared. The consequent whereof will be, that they, to whom the Lord's Prayer was given, were not under an obligation to make it, at the time of the giving of that Prayer, because before the Doctrine of the Trinity was cleared to the World. Which, though it will not altogether assail the present difficulty, yet will confer not a little to it, because furnishing us with a sufficient reason, why, in the proposing of this Prayer, Christ prompted them not to pay their acknowledgments to himself, and the Holy Ghost, as well as he had done unto the Father. For well might he omit the mention of those acknowledgments, which were not incumbent upon *them* to whom he directed himself, and who, as being the nearest to him, were primarily to be considered by him. Only, if it should be replied thereupon, that nothing hinders this Prayer from being defective as to *our* information, to whom the Doctrine of the Trinity hath been sufficiently clear'd, and we therefore under an obligation to acknowledge the particular persons of it; I shall *finally* make answer, that so it would be, if considered only in it self, yea could not well be otherwise, as being to provide for persons of different states; for those to whom the Doctrine of the Trinity was as yet obscure, and for those to whom it was sufficiently reveal'd. But as we are not therefore to entertain the worse opinion of it (for who should expect that from the Lord's Prayer, which no one Prayer whatsoever is able to effect?) so there is no reason at all, as to the former acknowledgments, to consider it barely in it self, but rather as in Conjunction with such places of Scripture as pretend to give an account of the Trinity; Because (as hath been often said) those acknowledgments whereof we speak are founded upon the Doctrine of it. All therefore that will remain to shew is, that this Prayer of our Lord, in conjunction with the Doctrine of the Trinity, and those places of Scripture which teach it, doth prompt us to pay the same acknowledgments to the Son, and Holy Ghost, which we find it to do unto the Father. Now for this we shall need no other evidence than that Scripture's teaching us that the *Father and Son are one* in essence, yea that the whole three persons are so ^{in Joh. 10. 38.} ^{u Joh. 5. 7.} of God, that *all men should honour the Son* ^{x Joh. 5. 23.} ^{y Mat. 28. 19.} as they honour the Father, yea the Holy Ghost as well as either, because we are equally baptiz'd *into* ^y *his name*. For if the Son and Holy Ghost are one in essence with the Father, if they are not only one in essence with him, but to be honour'd with the same honour; then must that Prayer, which prompts us to honour the Father with the invocation of him, incite us as strongly to the invocation of the other two, because that is a part, yea a great part of the honour that is due to the divine nature. So far is it from being impossible to save the honour of the Trinity without interpreting the *Father* here spoken of, of the several persons of it; and then I hope it will be accounted no great Heresie to depart so far from the receiv'd opinion, as to interpret it of him, who is the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, as well as of *us* and of *the World*.

III. It appearing from what hath been said, who it is that is intended by the title of *Our Father which art in Heaven*, it will be but time to give an account of the title it self, and of the several appellations whereof it is made up. Where first, I will animadvert upon the words

Our Father, and then upon those that follow, even *which art in Heaven*.

1. Now as in the former of these, as well as the latter, there are again two things to be enquir'd, first what is the due sense and meaning of them, and secondly, what is the reason of our use of them; so I shall set my self so much the more carefully to the investigation of the first of these, because an opinion hath prevail'd that we are to understand by the words *Our Father*, not *Our Father*, by *creation and providence*, but by *adoption and grace*, and which is a title that Christianity gives us a right to call God by. If they who so opine had no other intention in it, than to intimate that they who can call God Father in the latter of these senses may and ought to do it, and comfort themselves with the belief and the expression of it, I should not go about to contradict them; partly because God hath *sent forth his Spirit into the hearts* of such persons to cry *z Abba Father* in that sense, and partly because I find that the Lords Prayer was not geneaally *a* delivered to any to be us'd, till they had been baptiz'd, and so put into a capacity of giving God that appellation. But that that is not the primary intention of the words *Our Father*, and much less that they ought to be taken in that restrained sense, will appear from these two things; first, that even they, to whom God is a Father by *adoption and grace*, have not all of them, at all times, the confidence to call God Father in that sense; and secondly, that there is reason to believe, even from the possessive *Our*, that it was the intention of our Saviour here to represent him as the Father of those, to whom he is not such by adoption and grace, as well as of those to whom he is. That even they, to whom God is a Father by adoption and grace, have not all of them, at all times, the confidence to call God *Father*, in the more strict and spiritual sense of it, will need no other proof than that there are weak Christians as well as strong, and who are ever and anon doubting of their interest in him, to whom they are here directed to address themselves. By which means they shall, during those doubts be either excluded from the use of Lords Prayer, and indeed from all other Christian ones that are framed by its example (as what Prayers are there, that ought not to be so?) or be obliged to the use of it, even when they cannot, with sufficient assurance, give God that title, yea be forced to prevaricate in it: Neither the one nor the other of which can be believ'd by those, who do also believe God to be a God of truth, or a merciful one; Because, if he be a merciful God, he will so provide, that the weakest persons may address themselves unto him, and, if a God of truth, that they may do it; without any infringement to that truth, in which he professeth to delight. And indeed, however some men, for want of a due consideration of the different sorts of Christians, may have exalted the name of *Father* to such a sense, as none but strong ones could call him by; yet would they not have given way to such a conceit, if they had as duly weigh'd the due importance of that Particle *Our* which is added to it. For what reason is there to restrain that title of *Our Father*, to the Father of us Christians, nay what reason is there, not to take it in a more enlarged sense? That the Particle *Our*, and others of the like nature *b* that follow, do oblige us to pray for other men as well as for our selves, is evident from the design of Christ in the first delivery of this Prayer, even the directions of our

z Rom. 8 15.

a Constitut. Apostolic. lib. 7. c. 44. cum Not. Corelerii.

b Give us this day, for give us, &c.

our most private and retired Devotions by it. For that this was both Christs and its primary design, is manifest from his subjoining it to the mention of such Prayers as were intended not for the *Synagogues* or *c the corners of the streets*, but for the *Closet d*, and from which all other Eyes *d* — 6. and Ears were to be excluded, save of him who *sees and hears in secret*. For those being the Prayers to which he doth immediately before refer, and indeed recommend and enjoin the use of, we must of necessity suppose the following directions concerning Prayer, and particularly this platform of his own, to have had a principal regard to them, and to the several Petitions they were to put up. The result of which observation, and of the language of that Prayer (as which teacheth us to say, not *My Father* but *Our Father*, and again, not *Give me my daily bread*, but *Give us ours*) is a necessity of Praying for other men as well as for our selves, even in our most private Devotions. That therefore being manifestly the design of the Lords Prayer, and so acknowledged to be by all Christians whatsoever, let us in the next place enquire for what others it teacheth us to pray, that is to say, whether for such only as are of the Household of Faith, and so have God for their Father in that regard also, or for such also as are strangers to it, yea all men whatsoever. A question, which will not long be such, to him who considers Christs laying down his life for all, or the Scriptures enjoining us to express the like love to all, and particularly by our praying for them. For neither can we think less than that enjoined here, especially considering it as a perfect Form and pattern of Prayer, when he, whom we are elsewhere *e* requir'd to propose as ours, was no less universal in his love, yea commanded, by his Apostle, to take this particular way of expressing it. Though if any man desire a further proof from the Prayer it self, will not be difficult for him to furnish himself from that particular Petition, which teacheth us to pray, that *his will may be done on Earth, as it is in Heaven*. For if (as I shall afterwards shew) that be to be desired for our benefit, as well as for his honour, and that we may obey him as we ought to do, as well as that his laws may have obedience; our desire that that will of his may be done in the Earth indefinitely taken, must respect all the several inhabitants thereof, of what quality or condition soever. But from hence it will follow thirdly, which will bring yet us nearer to the thing we aim at, that we ought to understand the words, *Father*, and *Our Father*, not with a limitation to such a paternity as he may be supposed to have over a few, but as it may be supposed to extend it self to all men whatsoever, even as many as we are bound to pray for. For if every single man be oblig'd by this Prayer to pray for other men as well as himself, yea for all other men as well as some particular ones; if that obligation of his be marked out by his being prompted to say, not *My Father*, but *Our Father*, nor *Give me my daily bread*, but *give us ours*, then must the word *Father* be taken in such a sense, as may have a regard to as many, as we are taught to comprehend in the words *Our* and *Us*, and consequently to all men whatsoever. The consequence whereof will be fourthly, that by *Our Father* we are to understand, not *Our Father* by adoption and grace, because that Paternity reacheth but to a few, but by creation and providence, as which, and which alone is of so universal an extent. And indeed, as that notion of Gods Paternity is no stranger at all to the Scriptures (for thus we find the Prophet *Malachi f* interpreting his own *f* Mal 1. 10.

question of *Have we not all one Father*, by *Hath not one God created us*, and, which is a tantamount to that, St. Paul representing us as *the offspring of God* g, because *in him we live, and move, and have our being*) so that Paternity of God is no improper one, yea it is a much more proper paternity than that of any Earthly Parent : Because, over and above his giving being unto him, from whom we originally descended, and in whom therefore we may not improperly be said to have been begotten by him, it is he who gave force and energy to those who concurred more immediately to it, and thereby became more properly *Our Father*, than they from whose Loins we descended ; It is the same God who maintains us in our being, after we have acquired it, or rather doth every moment create us anew, by those fresh supplies of his divine influence, which he continues to minister to us. Which is a sort of Paternity that hath no footsteps in any Earthly Parent, because, after he hath begotten us, he ministers nothing to us of his own, to help to keep up that being which he gave. In fine, to let you see yet more clearly, how far the paternity of God transcends that of any Earthly Parent, it is the same God, who, by his providence, furnisheth the Parent with those external supplies which he ministreth unto us, who prompts that Parent to a readiness to minister them, and, which is more, blesteth those supplies unto us. From all which as it doth appear, how truly God may be said to be *Our Father* in the sense which is now under consideration; so the explication I have now given of it will enable me to give a more satisfactory account of the use of that compellation in Prayer, the reasons whereof I am in the next place to propose. Now there are two things which may be assign'd as the reasons of that compellation whereby we make entrance into the present Prayer, to wit, either first to do honour to Gods Paternity, and particularly by an acknowledgment of our own dependance on it, or secondly, to encourage us with the consideration of it, and of the benefit that may accrue to us thereby. For the design of Prayer, with respect to God, being to do honour to him, and particularly by an acknowledgment of our own dependance on him, it cannot but be thought one reason of calling God *Father*, to declare thereby that we look upon him as one, from whom we receiv'd our being, and by whom we are, and must be maintained in it, that we owe the sustentation of our being to the influences of his providence, to those external supplies which he furnisheth us withal, and to his blessing in the use of them. And were all these things as duly weighed by us when we give God the title of *Father*, as they are certainly included in it, they would not only serve to make up a due acknowledgment of his excellencies, to whom we address our selves, but prompt us to also acknowledge them in *fact* as well as *word*, even by that obedience and respect which is due to a Father as such. Only as nothing hinders us (if there be any thing *in that* to found it on) to encourage our selves as well by the title of *Father*, as to declare our dependance upon God by it; so that it was really intended by Christ as an encouragement to us in our addresses, is not only evident from that kindness which the name of a *Father* imports, but from the use our Saviour afterwards makes of it to prompt us to pray unto him. For if (as he afterwards discourseth) the name of *Father* be so far a name of kindness and benevolence, that we cannot lightly expect from any one, in whom it is, but that he should shew forth *b* a proportionable kindness and benevolence to his Children ;

Children ; if that benevolence and kindness may with much more reason be expected from our *Heavenly Father* ;, than it can be from any *Earthly* one ; Lastly, if the consideration of that paternal benevolence and kindness in God ought to be a motive unto us to encourage us in our addressees to him, as we see it is so *k* made by him who represents *k* *Mat. 7. 7, &c.* it ; Then can we not doubt, in the least, but that he set the title of *Father* in the Front of this Prayer of his, to encourage us so much the more in the presenting of it : What is so proper for the encouraging of Prayer in the general, and, beside that, elsewhere represented by him for that very end and purpose, being not to be thought to have been forgotten by him, where he professeth the directing of Prayer, and of us in the presenting of it.

I have considered the word *Father* hitherto, in that which I deem to be the primary sense thereof, because the only one that can answer those many Sons of God, for whom Christianity, yea this particular Prayer obligeth us to intercede. But as I would not be thought to exclude that other and better notion of it, whereby God becomes *Our Father* by adoption and grace, so there is great reason to believe that we are to look upon that as connoted in it, even by him who hath taught us so to call him. That which first induced me so to think, was the either interpretations or practice of the *Ancients*, and who, by reason of their nearness to our Saviour, and his Apostles, cannot well be thought to be ignorant of the due meaning of their words, especially in a matter of so general concernment. For not only doth *Tertullian*, the first of those who commented upon this Prayer, represent the Son as invoked in the *Father*, but affirm moreover *l*, that our Mother the Church is not forgotten in it, yea honoured together with the other. Which could not in any wise have been affirmed by him, were it not that he apprehended God to be stil'd a *Father* here, in that sense wherein the Church is affirmed to be a Mother, even by a spiritual production. To the same purpose doth *St. Cyprian* discourse, though, as his manner is, with much more clearness. Witness his intimating this Prayer to be the Prayer of a regenerate man *m* ; his interpreting the words, *Our Father* by the *Father* of them that believe, and who by means of that Faith, and their Spiritual regeneration, become the Children of God ; in fine, his affirming this compellation of *Our Father* to be so proper to the *Christians*, that the *Jews* cannot any longer use it *o*, because from the first time he became a *Father* to the *Christians*, he ceased to be such unto the *Jews*.

Words so express and clear for that sense I am now propugning, that I shall need rather to fence myself against them, for having before advanced a more general one, than to add farther strength to them. Though (that I may not omit any thing, which may be of force in this affair) that interpretation stands yet farther confirm'd by the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and the account they give us of the practice of the Church. It appearing from thence, that the first thing that was requir'd of any man that was baptiz'd, was the reciting of the *p* *Lords Prayer*, as a Symbol of his then becoming the Son of that Father *q*, to whom it was directed, and his right to call God by that name. For well may we think that Spiritual *q* *ibid. lib. 3. cap. 18.* Paternity, whereof I now speak, to have been understood by the *An*

*ibid.**Mat. 7. 7, &c.*

Item in patre filius invocatur. Ego enim, inquit, & pater unum sumus. Ne mater quidem Ecclesia prateritur ; siquidem in filio & patre mater recognoscitur, &c. Tert. de Orat. cap. 2.

m Homo novus, renatus, & Deo suo per gratiam ejus restitutus, Pater primo in loco dicitur, quia filius esse jam capit. De Orat. Dominic.

n Sed conjungimus & dicimus, Pater noster, id est eorum qui credunt, eorum qui per eum sanctificantur, & gratia spiritualis civitate reparati Dei filii esse caperunt. *ibid.*

o In quorum exprobrationem, Christiani, quando oramus, Pater noster, dicimus, quid noster esse cepit, & Judaeorum qui eum reliquerunt esse desit. *ibid.*

p Const. Apost. loco citato.

q *ibid. lib. 3. cap. 18.*

cient

cient Church, when they made the right of saying *Our Father*, to be the result of that *new birth*, which men acquir'd by being baptiz'd into it. Only if the *Apostolical Constitutions* should displease, whether for the uncertainty of their Author, or time, it will not be difficult to furnish our selves with a testimony, to the same purpose, from the *Father* but now quoted by us. For what less can *St Cyprian* be thought to intend

r Cyprian. loco citato.

f Qui ergo credidit in nomine ejus, & factus est Dei filius, hinc debet incipere, ut & gratias agat, & profiteatur se Dei filium, dum nominat Patrem sibi esse in caelis Deum; contestetur quoque inter primo stationem natiuitatis sua verba renunciasse se terreno & carnali patri, & patrem solum nosse se, & habere cupisse, qui sit in caelis. Cypr. ib.

t Rom. 8. 17.

u ---- 15.

when he saith, *The man who is become new, regenerate & restored to God, saith Father in the first place, because he hath now begun to be a Son.*

And a little after f, *He therefore who hath believed in his name, and is become the Son of God, ought to begin hence [even from the name of Father] and so as both to give thanks, and profess himself the Son of God, whilst he gives God the title of his Father that is in Heaven; to profess also, even amidst the first words he utters after his birth, that he hath renounc'd his Earthly and fleshy Parent, and that he acknowledgeth, and hath begun to account him only as his Father, who is in Heaven: This, as*

it is no obscure intimation of the practice before-mentioned, so shewing the ground thereof to have been the propriety of this Prayer to those who were by grace made the Children of God, and consequently that it is, in that sense, that he is here stiled *Father*. Being thus satisfied, so far as I could be, from the Doctrine and practice of the Ancient Church, that we were to understand the word *Father*, as denoting him who was so by adoption and grace, I proceed to enquire what ground there might be for it in the Scripture, and from which I no way doubted it was collected by the other. That which first of all occur'd to me

therein, was the great reckoning it every where makes of our being the Children of God *in that sense*, as by which we have a right to a future inheritance, and a confidence for the present to call God by the name of *Father* u, and to converse with him as such. A circumstance which I could not reflect upon, without entring into a deep suspicion, that we ought therefore to impose the same sense upon the word *Father* there. For supposing that *Sonship* whereof we speak, to be of so glorious and comfortable a nature, that a greater privilege than it cannot well be thought to happen to humane nature; and we must also suppose the acknowledgment thereof to be none of the least of those, that ought to be made by us, when we address our selves to the divine Majesty. Which as it will make it equally necessary to believe that the *Lords Prayer* hath provided for it, because intended as a pattern to all our addresses, so give occasion also to presume that it was intended in that compellation wherewith we are taught to begin them; Partly because that compellation is sufficiently expressive of it, and partly because there are not any the least footsteps of such an acknowledgment in any other portion of it. But then when I moreover considered, what reason there was to believe, that we were taught to call God *Father* to encourage us in our addresses, as well as to make an acknowledgment thereby of our dependance on him; when I considered farther, that God did therefore send forth the spirit of adoption into our hearts, to enable us to call him by the name of *Father* in that sense also; I knew not how to avoid concluding from thence, that we ought to impose the same sense upon that title of *Father*, by which we are here taught to call him: Because otherwise Christ must have been thought to have provided less for our encouragement, than it appears by *St. Paul*, that God, and his Father intended for us; which there is the less reason to suppose,

pose, because it was by Christ's means, that we attain'd that spirit of adoption, which enables us to call him *Father* in that more comfortable acceptation of it. And though I will not positively affirm, that when *St Paul* spake of the Christians crying *Abba Father*, he alluded therein to that compellation, whereby we are here taught to call him; yet, as he doth sufficiently intimate it to have been the usual title, whereby the Christians of his time were wont to salute him to whom they address'd themselves; so cannot a more probable account be given of the original of that custom, than their being taught so to stile him by that Prayer which is now under consideration, because intended by the Author thereof for the regulation of their several addresses, and therefore not unreasonably suppos'd to have given occasion to that title of *Father*, whereby they were wont to call him. The result whereof will be the understanding by *Father* here, *our Father by adoption*, because said to be prompted to it, not by any common spirit, but by that more peculiar and Christian one, even the *spirit of adoption*. By such considerations as these did I at length arrive at some competent assurance of our understanding by the name of *Father*, him who is so by adoption and grace, as well as by Creation and Providence; but I was yet farther confirmed in it, when I remembred this Prayer to have been a part of Christ's *Sermon upon the Mount* to his *Disciples*, and which appears by several \times passages thereof to have been specially intended for the regulation of their actions. For, being such, I thought it but reason to conclude, that it was so fram'd by the Author of it, as to fit them with an acknowledgment of that near relation they stood in to God, and to which they were admitted by being *Disciples*. Which could not at all be, if, by requiring them to call God *Father*, it did not also enable them to acknowledge him to be a Father, *by adoption and grace*, as well as by *creation and providence*; because, as *Disciples*, they became his *Children* in the latter sense, as well as in the former one. Mat. 5. 13, 14.

But because it may be demanded, how, supposing this *latter* and more *restrained* sense of the word *Father*, to have been intended, it will be possible for us to reconcile it with that more *general* one which I *before* advanc'd; and because that difficulty is yet more encreas'd by the either interpretations, or practise of the *Ancient Church*, as which is known not only to have appropriated the use of the *Lords Prayer* to baptized persons, but to have done it upon the account of their being the only men, who could call God *Father* in the sense that is there intended; therefore for the better establishment of each of the forementioned senses, I will attend to this difficulty also, though, if we do more nearly approach it, we shall find it to be no such considerable one. That which occasions me so to affirm, is the no real inconsistency there is between them, whether we do consider them meerly as *different* senses, or also as *contrary* ones. For neither first is it any inconvenience to affirm, that God may be stil'd a *Father* in *both* of them; in the one as he is the Father of *all men* whatsoever, in the other as he is the Father of *Christians only*. On the contrary, there is reason to believe, that we ought to look upon him under each of them; under the latter, because that is more appropriate to our selves and other Christians, but under the former also, because it is equally certain that we ought to join Heathens as well as Christians with our selves, and, consequently thereto, to suppose God to be a *Father* also to them, which he cannot be deem'd

deem'd to be, but only by Creation and Providence. So far forth therefore as these two senses are considered merely as *different* ones, so far I say there cannot be any inconsistency between them. I will add yet farther, that there is reason enough to think, that each of them may be intended, even with relation to our selves; because, how glorious soever that *Sonship* may be which we receive by adoption and grace, yet that, which ariseth from God's giving us our temporal being, ought not to be forgotten by us, if it were only because it is the foundation of the other. It is true indeed, that the former of these ought much more to be considered and acknowledged, and I no way doubt that was one reason, why the *Ancients* took such notice of it, that they may seem to have had no consideration of the other, or of God's being the Author of it: but as it doth not therefore follow, that the other ought to be altogether excluded, or God, and our Father not acknowledged for it; so supposing both the one and the other to have place, it will also appear that there might be reason enough for the Churches appropriating the *Lords Prayer* to the use of baptized persons, without restraining the signification of the *Paternity* there spoken of, to that which is founded in adoption and grace: Because though they, who were as yet unbaptiz'd, might call God *Father* in the more general sense of the word; yet they could not in this more *restrained* one, and which was as much, or rather more intended by our Saviour in it. If there be any exception to be made against the admitting of both these senses, it must be for their being *contrary*, as well as *different* ones, which yet they will not be found to be: because though God ought to be look'd upon as a *Father*, both in a more general and a more restrained sense, yet it is with respect to different persons, or at least to the same persons in different capacities; in the former as he may be suppos'd to be the Father of us *as men*, and so the Father of all men whatsoever; in the latter, as he may be suppos'd to be the Father of us *as Christians*, and so of no other than those that are such. Which, as it is a sufficient proof of the no contrariety that is between them, because nothing hinders us to stile God *Father*, both in a more general and a more restrained sense, provided we do it with respect to men of different capacities, so it will furnish us with a distinct Explication of them both, and of those words of the *Lords Prayer*, that were intended to insinuate them; The sense of the words *Our Father* being no other than this, *O thou who art the common Father of us all, but, by a yet more special paternity, the Father of such of us as are Christians, because superadding to our temporal being a spiritual and gracious one; grant both to the one and the other of us those blessings which we beg, and particularly, that we may worship, serve, and obey thee, as Children ought to do so excellent a Father.* In the mean time, as we do most willingly acknowledge our dependance upon thee, as the Father both of our temporal and spiritual being; so being priviledg'd by him, who hath taught us so to call thee, and encourag'd by that love and kindness which the name of a Father involves, and particularly of such a Father who hath begotten us to an eternal inheritance, we take the confidence to believe, that thou wilt as readily grant us all those boons, which we importune thee our Heavenly Father to bestow.

I will conclude my Discourse concerning the title we are now upon, when I have added to what hath been already said, That as we are, by the prescript of this Prayer, to call God the Father of *other men*, as well

well as of *ourselves*, yea of *all men* whatsoever, as well as *Christians*; so we are taught so to do, to mind us of having a regard to *them*, even in our most private Prayers, as well as to our *own personal* welfare. A thing, which though sufficiently evident from the language of the Prayer it self, yet is so pathetically express'd by St Cyprian, in his Comment upon this Prayer, that I cannot forbear to set it down in that Authors words. *Before all things*, saith he, *the teacher of peace, and the Master of Unity, forbade the making of Prayer so particularly or privately, that he, who prays, should at any time pray for himself alone. For we do not say, My Father which art in Heaven, nor Give me this day my Bread, neither doth every man pray that God would forgive him alone his Debt, or ask for himself alone not to be led into temptation, or delivered from evil. We have always, and every where, a publick and common Prayer, and when we pray, we pray not for one, but for all the people, because all of us are but one. The God of Peace, and the Master of Concord, who taught Unity, would have one so pray for all, as he himself bore all in one*, even in that one humane nature which he assum'd. Which last passage, by the way, in a farther Argument of our considering God as the Father of all men as well as of Christians, yea of the Ancients understanding the word *Father* in the former of those senses also, though they insist only upon the latter of them: Because it is certain, that Christ bore upon him both the nature and concerns of all Mankind, and must consequently thereto be thought to require us to pray for all men whatsoever; yea to sue to God in our addressees, as their Father as well as our own.

An account being thus given of that first *compellation* wherewith we are here taught to approach God and our Father, we are now to consider of what our Saviour superadds to it, even his *being in Heaven*, whom we are before instructed to call upon. Where again, I will enquire what is meant by that addition, and the reason of our Saviour's making it, or our own use of it.

Now by *being in Heaven* we are to understand his being more especially there, or rather his there displaying the chiefest of his glories, and particularly those of his *Majesty and greatness*; Partly, because it is equally certain from the Scripture, that he *fillerth Earth* y as well as *Heaven* with his presence, and partly, because the same Scripture gives such an account of his being there. Witness its affirming *z* that *that Heaven is his Throne*, or that *his Throne a is in it*; its affirming, consequently thereto, that he doth from thence dispence rewards *b* and punishments *c*, even by the ministry of those Angels, who do *always behold his face there* *d*, to know and execute *e* his pleasure. Witness, in fine, the same Scriptures bringing in holy men, when they would provoke God *f* to execute judgement, begging of him that he would *return g on high*, or into Heaven, as if he either did not, or could not execute judgment out of it. For these and the like passages shew plainly, that by Gods *being in Heaven* we are to understand his being *there* as on a *glorious Throne*, and, consequently thereto, bearing himself as a Prince on it, and issuing forth his Commands and Judgments from it. By which means the title of *Our Father which art in Heaven*, will be found to be of the same importance With the *Optume Maxume* among the Heathen, and wherewith they were wont to salute the great superintendent over the World; The word *Father* denoting his superlative goodness, as the words *which art in Heaven*, as superlative a Majesty and greatness.

L This

y Jer. 23. 24.

z Isa. 66. 1.

a Pla. 11. 4.

b — 57. 3.

c — 76. 8.

d Mat. 18. 10.

e Pla. 103. 21.

f — 7. 6.

g — 7.

h Mal. 1. 6.

This therefore being the meaning of the words that are now under consideration, and so evinced to be from the known language of the Scripture, it will be but time to enquire into the reasons of our Saviours Injunction of them, and our own use thereof in accordance with it. Where again we will consider them with reference to God, and then with reference to our selves. If we consider them *with reference to God*, and to whom we know all Prayer to be design'd in the first place to do honour, so we shall find them to have been intended as a farther acknowledgment of his excellencies, and particularly of his Majesty and greatness. An acknowledgment, which no condescension of his can licence us to forget, because he can never so far descend from his greatness, as to forget himself to be a Prince. For though God do not delight to be look'd upon as a Tyrant, no nor yet as a Prince who is made up only of justice and greatness; yet Authority and Majesty are things inseparable from his nature, neither can he any more cease to be great, than to be good. He is indeed most willing to be owned by us as a *Father*, he was always desirous of being so considered, and much more since the Revelation of the Gospel: but as *Father* is a title of Authority as well as goodness, and accordingly did sometime give occasion to God to expostulate, *if I be a Father h, where is mine honour*; so lest the benignity of that title should make us look upon him as an easy one, as we know there want not such among Earthly Parents, he took care to distinguish himself from them by styling himself an Heavenly one, and by prompting us to look up to that place where he rules and governs, and from whence despatches his judgments, as well as mercies. Only, as what was thus intended as an acknowledgment of God's Majesty and greatness, cannot lightly be thought not to have been intended also to produce in us such an awful regard, as so great a Majesty may be thought to require; so we are therefore also to look upon it as an admonition to *our selves* to put on the like awful regard, yea temper our filial confidence with it: Lest happily instead of finding from him the affection of a *tender Father*, we meet with the severity of an incensed one, or rather of him, who though he may allow us to call him *Father*, yet must be remembred not to be without the Majesty of a *Prince*, and which will require something more from us, than a bare dependance on him. For even the natural issue of Princes are Subjects as well as Children; how much more then the Children of God, who, though not without some resemblance of their *Father which is in Heaven*, yet are said to beholden to an *adoption*, to make them fully and perfectly such: Now for as much as God is our Prince as well as Father, and we accordingly Subjects to him as well as Children of him; for as much as it concerns us as Subjects to approach God with an awful regard, as well as it doth (as Children) with the confidence of those that are such; it cannot but be thought our duty so to temper the one with the other, that whilst we call God Father, we remember him to be such a one as hath his habitations in the Heaven, yea presides and governs there. But as if we take care to consider and acknowledge him as such a Father, we cannot lightly entertain any suspicion of his denying us any just requests; so what requests are such, is the business of the following Petitions to describe, and shall accordingly be my business also to explain

Hallowed be thy Name.

The CONTENTS.

What is meant by the name of God, and what by the hallowing of it : Toward the former whereof is shewn, that by the name of God we are to understand first and chiefly his nature, and secondly those names by which he is described, and, by analogy thereto, all other things that have any near relation to him ; toward the latter, that we are to understand by hallowing, an honourable acknowledgment of him, and particularly of the holiness of his nature. That that hallowing is a thing to be performed by our selves, and enquiry thereupon made, how the name of God ought to be hallowed by us. Which is considered first with reference to the divine nature and perfections, and then with reference to those things which have any near relation to them, and particularly to his name. The ground of hallowing sacred things, and what kind of hallowing they require of us, which is shewn both in the general, and in particular. What we desire of God here toward the hallowing of his name, and the necessity of imploring the divine grace in order to it.

NOW the first Petition that presents it self, is that, which is now before us, even *the hallowing of his name*, to whom we are before directed to address our selves ; where again I will enquire what is meant by the *Name of God*, and what by its being *sanctified*, or *hallowed* ; how the name of God ought to be hallowed, and what, we beg of him towards the hallowing thereof.

I. As concerning the *Name of God*, no doubt can well be made, but that we are first and especially to understand thereby *him*, whose that name is, and whom accordingly it is made use of to describe. To persuade us thereunto, we have first the Scripture's so often making use of the word *name* to express the person to whom it doth belong ; yea doing so, when it entreats of that name which is now under consideration. It is in this sense that St. *Luke* makes use of it, where he tells us, that *the number of the names a together were about an hundred and twenty*, ^{a Act. 1. 15.} because intended to let us know how many those Disciples were, in the midst of whom St. *Peter* stood up ; and to whom he there directed his Speech ; it is in the same sense that we are to understand St. *John*, where he speaks of those few names *b in Sardis, which had not defiled their garments*, as elsewhere of those *seven thousand names c of men* (for so it is in the Greek) *which were found slain by the Earthquake* there recited : ^{b Rev. 3. 4. c — 11. 13.} The names of men, as such, being not capable either of clean, or defiled Garments, and much less of perishing by an Earthquake. Thus it is manifest, that the Scripture speaks with relation to men, and those names whereby they are described ; and that it holds the same language in its discourse concerning God, those many expressions which we meet with of *calling upon d his name, building Temples e to it, and believing f it*, may serve for an abundant evidence. For not to say, that God himself

himself is not capable of greater honours, than those which are there recorded as given to his name ; to pay such honours to his name were to commit Idolatry with it, yea to set up that name against him that bears it ; the name of God, in strict speaking, being no other than a note, or character whereby his divine nature is represented to us. Which as it will yet more incline us to the so understanding of it here, because we are not only taught to desire the sanctification of it, but to do so before the coming of his Kingdom, or the doing of his will ; so especially, if we consider, that, whatever honour may be due unto his name, that honour must be suppos'd to be much more due unto his person, as from which it derives all its regard. For if even the name of God ought to have honour from us, yea ought to have the sanctification of it made a part of our requests to God ; how much more may we think our selves oblig'd to desire the sanctification of his person, yea suppose it to have been our Saviours intention to prompt us to the desiring of it ? Only, as when we say, that by the name of God we are especially to understand him, whose name it is, nothing hinders us to understand also, though in an inferiour sense, that name, or names, by which he is described ; so there is reason enough to believe, that it was intended by our Saviour in some measure, when he prompted us to beg the hallowing of God's name. Partly, because (as I shall afterwards shew) that name of his ought to be hallowed by us, and partly, because the hallowing of it tends to the hallowing of him upon whom that name is call'd. For if the name of God be to be hallowed, as well as his person ; if the hallowing of that name do moreover tend to the sanctification of that person, on whom it is impos'd ; then ought it to be look'd upon as a part of that Petition, whereby we are taught to beg the hallowing of God's name : that as it is most agreeable to the letter of the Petition, and therefore not without great reason, to be excluded from the intention of it ; so much less if it may appear to conduce to the promoting of that sanctification, which it is agreed upon, on all hands, to have been principally designed by it. All therefore that will be incumbent on us to shew is, that the name of God ought to be hallowed, and that the hallowing of that name tends to the hallowing of his person, which accordingly I will set my self to do. Give me leave only to clear my way to it by an explication of that sanctification, or hallowing, which we affirm to be due unto the name of God, as well as to him whose name it is.

g Discourse on
Mat. 6. 9.
Luk. 11. 2.

II. In order whereunto, we are first to know, that as the words *sanctifying* or *hallowing* are manifestly borrowed from *sanctity* or *holiness*, so we cannot take a better course towards the explication thereof, than by shewing what *sanctity*, or *holiness* is, especially as attributed unto God. Now that (as Mr Mede hath shewn g at large) is nothing else than the peculiar excellency of his divine nature ; as that too not so much for this or that perfection of it, as for all those perfections wherewith it is endu'd. I will not make so bold with that Learned man, as to transcribe the several Arguments produced by him ; it shall suffice me to observe in short, that the former of these is evident, not only from the interpretation of the Jews, and who make words of *sanctity* to import a thing separated, or divided from other things by way of pre-eminence or excellency, but from the Scriptures explaining that which is *holy* h by that which is separated from other things, from its opposing things

1Lv. 20. 24,
26.
Deut. 26. 18,
19.

things that *i* are *holy* to those that are *common*; and in fine, from its making the *holiness* of God to be the ground of that *adoration* *k*, which is due unto him. For if *holy* in the Language of the Scripture be no other than *separate* or *singular*, as the Scriptures explaining it by *separate*, and opposing it to that which is *common*, shews; if, when considered as subjected *in God*, it be a ground of that *adoration* which is due from us to the divine Majesty; then must it be thought to denote the peculiar excellencies of the divine nature, because it is by means of those excellencies that it comes to be ador'd. And though it be true, that the Holiness of God is sometime taken in a more restrained sense, and particularly, for a freedom in him / from all those sinful impurities, wherewith the Sons of men are tainted; yet must it be allowed to be of a more comprehensive sense in its own nature, yea as containing within the compass of it all the excellencies of his divine nature. Because it is not only made the ground of divine adoration, and which, as such, hath a respect to the several excellencies of his nature, and particularly to his goodness and greatness; but represented moreover, in particular, as the ground of that *fear* which we ought to have for him, and which we know more immediately to arise from the consideration of his Almighty Power. For *who*, saith St. *John* *m*, speaking of Gods Judgments upon the Beast, *shall not fear, and glorifie thy name, because thou art holy?* Which shews, that the word *holy*, as it relates to God, doth not only denote the purity of his nature, but the several excellencies thereof, and particularly that power of his for which he is so tremendous. This therefore being the true notion of that *sanctity* or *holiness*, for which the divine nature is so renown'd, we shall not be long to seek what is meant by that *sanctification* or *hallowing* of him, which this Petition teacheth us to implore. For the *holiness* of God's nature being a *singular* one, yea *infinite*, as he himself also is; by *sanctifying* or *hallowing* cannot be meant the *making him holy*, because his holiness is such as is incapable of any addition to it. From whence as it will therefore follow, that nothing else can be meant by it, than the *acknowledging* of that his holiness, and doing to him according to it; so that notion will be farther confirm'd by the explication the Scripture gives us of it: Witness first the Prophet *Isay's* explaining the *sanctifying the Lord God in our hearts* *n*, by making him *our fear and our dread*. For that shews the sanctification requir'd of us to be only the acknowledging of his holiness, and putting on a demeanour suitable to it. The same notion will be yet more clear from those many places of Scripture, where *sanctified* and *glorified* are join'd together as words of the same signification, such as is among others that of the Prophet *Moses*, or rather of that God, concerning whom we are now discoursing; his words (as that Prophet recites them) being no other, than that he would be *sanctified in them that came nigh to him* *o*, and before all the people he would be *glorified*. For this shews the sanctification of God to be no other than the acknowledging of his holiness, and paying God that *glory* and *honour* which is due unto him because of it. Whence it is that *Hesychius*, none of the worst Interpreters of the Scriptures, translates *αγιαζε* or *sanctifie*, by *σεβε* or *reverence* and *worship*, which is the notion of the forementioned places, and of our own *Catchism* *p* concerning it. It is to be observed thirdly, that forasmuch as the divine holiness comprehends within the compass of it, all those excellencies and perfections wherewith his nature is adorn'd; therefore

Act. 10. 15.
Heb. 10. 29.
1^a Pla. 99. 5.
— 9.

1^a Pet. 1. 13.
16.

Rev. 15. 4.

1^a Isa. 8. 13.

Lev. 10. 3.

p I desire my Lord God, &c. to send his grace unto me, and to all people that we may worship him, &c. Explication of the Lord's Prayer.

therefore by the *sanctifying* or *hallowing* thereof must generally be meant the *acknowledging* of them all, and demeaning our selves answerably to them: How much more, where the sanctification desir'd is not restrain'd to any particular excellency of the divine nature, but appli'd to his *name*, or *nature*? Lastly, for as much as Gods holiness is a *singular* one, and such of which there is no like in created beings, therefore to the due sanctification thereof, it is but requisite that it have *singular acknowledgments* and honours, and such as do *as far* transcend the acknowledgments or honours of all created excellencies.

III. It appearing from the premises what is meant by the *name* of God, and what by the *sanctifying* or *hallowing* thereof, enquire we in the next place *how* that name of his *ought* to be hallowed, which will bring us yet more near to a due understanding of the thing desir'd. Where again, I will consider the *name* of God, as either denoting his *person* and *nature*, or as denoting those *names* by which he is describ'd, and, by analogy thereto, all other things, that have any near relation to him. This only would be premis'd for the better understanding of that sanctification that is due to each of them; that though he, whose name we speak of, be the person of whom the hallowing thereof is desir'd, yet it neither is, nor can be the intent of this Petition to desire its being hallowed *by himself*, but *by us*, who are instructed to desire it: Partly, because this and all other Petitions do principally regard the welfare of those by whom they are put up, and partly because the hallowing of God's name being no other than an honourable acknowledgment of it and him, it must be supposed to be the part of those, who are distinct from him, and inferiour to him, because such acknowledgments are due from an inferiour to him who is superiour to him. Which will consequently determine our enquiries concerning the hallowing of God's name to the hallowing of it by our selves, and what we are obliged to in order to the hallowing of it.

I. What *sanctification* or *hallowing* is due from us to the *name* of God, as that may be supposed to denote his *person* and *nature*, cannot better be judged of than by a particular Survey of the several *excellencies* thereof, and the sanctification, or hallowing which each of those may be supposed to require of us. But because by sanctifying or hallowing the excellencies of the divine nature, we are to understand no other than the making honourable and suitable acknowledgments thereof; and because I have elsewhere *q* given a minute account of those acknowledgments answerably to the several excellencies to which they do belong; I shall content my self to observe from thence, that we ought to sanctifie each of those excellencies both in our *Souls* and *Bodies*; As in the *former* of these again by a *right-conception* of them in our minds, or *suitable affections* to them in our hearts, which latter is thus far countenanced, even by the *letter* of the Scripture, that it explains the *sanctifying* the Lord God in our hearts, by making him *our fear* and *our dread*; In our *Bodies* again, by giving him the *praises* of our tongue, or glorifying him by a *lowly prostration* of the whole; In *both* the one and the other, by presenting him with such *separate* and *peculiar* testimonies of our regard, as may be supposed to be due to him, who is so transcendently great and holy: This, as it is undoubtedly the sense of that *sanctification*, or *hallowing*, which is due from us to the divine nature, so presenting us *so far* with an apt interpretation of the present Prayer,

q Explicat. of
the first Com-
mandm. Part.
2. &c.

Prayer, even that it would please that God, who is infinitely glorious in all his Attributes, so to provide, that we and all the world may conceive rightly of them, be suitably affected toward them, and in fine declare both the one and the other by the expressions of our mouths, and by all those other ways, whereby our outward man is capable of doing honour to him.

2. But because there is reason enough to believe, that by hallowing the name of God, we are as well to understand it of the name it self, as of him who bears it; and by parity of reason, of all those other things, which have any near relation to him: therefore consider we the name of God in the more strict and literal notation of it, as that again, with a design to shew the reasonableness of our hallowing of it, and what kind of hallowing it requires of us. I alledge for the former of these, that Authority which we have both from Scripture and reason, for the hallowing of those things, which bear any near relation to God. For thus we are told by the Scripture, that we ought to keep the Sabbath day, to sanctifie it, and, which is tantamount to that, that we ought to reverence Gods Sanctuary, as well as pay a respect unto the other. And that there is not less ground from reason for these and other things of the like nature, will appear, if we consider them, either as expressly commanded by God to be set apart for his Service, or set apart for that service of his by men. If question be made concerning those things, which are by any expresse Command of God set apart for his Service, so we shall need to look no farther, than that very Command, for a ground of that sanctification, and respect, which we ought to pay them: Because as he who commands the setting apart of any thing for his Service, must consequently be thought to command our considering it as such; so he who neglects so to do, must in like manner be thought to violate that command of his, and that Authority by which it is enforced. If therefore there be any place for doubt, as to the ground of our sanctifying those things which are set apart for Gods Service, it must be as to the sanctifying of those which are set apart by men; which yet will not be difficult for us to discover. For if, as I have elsewhere shewn, there be reason enough to believe that God accepts of, yea is well pleased with such a consecration, that allowance and acceptation of his will be equally a ground of our sanctifying them, and honouring them as such; Gods acceptation of any thing, making it as truly sacred, as any expresse Command can be suppos'd to do. Whence it was, that the Sacrilege of Ananias and Sapphira, though conversant about a thing, which had no Command from God to require the devoting of it, was as signally punished, as we can suppose any other Sacrilege to be.

Now as after I have shewn, how reasonable it is to hallow those things which are set apart for Gods honour and service, it will be but consequent thereunto to enquire what kind of hallowing they require of us; so for my more advantageous resolution thereof I will consider of that hallowing, which is due to them in the general, and of that which may be supposed to be due to each of them in particular. In the general I observe, that the sacredness of those things, consisting in their being set apart for Gods honour and service, the most natural and most immediate hallowing thereof must consequently be, by appropriating them to that divine honour and service, for which they are for the most part design'd: because the appropriating of them to those uses doth

Deut. 5. 11.

Lev. 19. 30.

Explic. of the
First Com-
mandm. Part.
6.

Act. 5. 1. &c.

most

most naturally and most immediately declare our acknowledgment of the sacredness thereof. Thus sacred *times* are most naturally hallowed by appropriating them to God's worship and service, and consequently thereto, excluding from them the actions of our several vocations; as sacred *places* in like manner by assembling therein for divine worship, and not to treat of civil affairs, and much less make them the scene of light or evil ones. Sacred *persons* are hallowed by allowing them such an immunity from civil employments, as may enable them to intend their respective functions without disturbance, and sacred *vessels* by appropriating them to the uses of the Sanctuary, and not either converting them to civil and common uses, or making use of them, as *Belshazzar* sometime did *x*, in drunken entertainments. For the sacredness of these things consisting, as was before said, in being set apart for the forementioned services, that sacredness cannot be more naturally acknowledged, than by keeping them to those services, for which they were so set apart and appointed. Only as it may happen, that, what is so set apart, cannot without great prejudice to our selves, or others, be always kept to its proper use, so nothing hinders us in *those cases* to make use of it for others; yea to look upon *those cases* as no way intended in the sanctification of it: Because, (as appears from the practice of the Jews, and our Saviour's discourse upon it) the holiness of the *Sabbath* it self did not hinder *the leading of a beast to water y*, or the Disciples from *plucking or rubbing the ears of corn z in their hands*, when they were an *hungred*; nor the holiness of the *shew-bread a* from David's taking of it to himself, when he stood in need of it, and distributing thereof to those that were with him. The consequent whereof will be, that, though sacred things ought *for the most part* to be appropriated to sacred Offices, yet for the most part *only*, and when it may be done without great prejudice, either to our selves, or others; that sacred *times* may therefore admit of such labours, as either the necessity, or great conveniency of our civil affairs may prompt us to, and sacred *places*, upon a like necessity, or conveniency, be made use of for other purposes; and particularly for the performance of learned exercises (though to the immortal honour of the late *Archbishop of Canterbury* be it spoken, who, by erecting a *Theatre* for that purpose, hath redeem'd one of our most noted Churches from the performance of such exercises, and particularly from the ludicrous part thereof) that sacred *persons* in fine, how much soever devoted to sacred Offices, may be oblig'd to attend upon civil ones, when either the necessity or conveniency of the State may require it of them; and the sacred *Vessels* of the Temple, if not converted to another use in their proper shape and figure, yet be melted down into mony, to procure the redemption of Captives, or serve any just necessity of that Church or State, to which they do belong.

But because there are other ways of declaring our acknowledgments of things sacred, beside the *keeping them to their proper uses*, and particularly by some *outward testimony of respect*; therefore enquire we, in the next place, whether the affording them such outward testimonies be not also a part of that hallowing, which is due to them. Which that they are, seems to me evident *first*, from God's requiring of them, in consideration of the sacredness of the other. For thus, for instance, we find God requiring *Moses to put off his shoes from his feet b*, because

the

x Dan. 5. 2, 3.

y Luke 13. 15.

z ----- 6. 1.

a ----- 4.

b Exo. 3. 5.

the place whereon he stood was holy ground, and the Captain of the Lord's Host commanding Joshua to loose his shoe from his c, because the place ^c Josh. 5. 15. whereon he stood was in like manner sacred. For well may we look upon such like testimonies of respect, as but due to sacred things, which had not only the command of God to require the praying of them, but that command moreover founded in the nature of those things, to which they are required to be paid. Which Argument will be yet more cogent, if we consider, *in the second place*, the use such testimonies of respect may be of, to preserve either in our selves, or others, that reverent esteem which we ought to have of them. For men naturally paying some outward testimony of respect to that which they have an inward veneration for; were not such outward testimonies of respect paid to sacred places, neither should we our selves long preserve in our minds that esteem which we ought to have of them, nor incline others to the preservation of it. Of which yet if there be any doubt, we have the practice of the *late times* for a witness, and where the disuse of such outward testimonies of respect in places set apart for Gods worship, was followed shortly after. I do not say by an opinion of there being no sacredness in them, but by converting them into a Den of Thieves, yea a Stable of Horses, for so we know the most magnificent Church here sometime was, to the great scandal of our Religion. And though it be true, that the capriciousness of this Age hath taught men in a great measure to lay aside these outward testimonies of respect, and, which is more, inveigh against them, as superstitious, or idolatrous; Yet as it is hard for men altogether to throw off those things, which the principles of natural Religion do secretly prompt them to, so we may find even in the most scrupulous, some footsteps of those external respects, which we affirm to be due to sacred things. How otherwise comes it to pass, that the *Lord's day* is to this very moment distinguished by them from others by the putting on of their best Apparel, and, as it is undoubtedly, a day of great joy and thanksgiving, so provided accordingly of the *garments of praise*? How comes it to pass, that the same sacred day, where superstition hath not prevail'd to turn it into a Fast, is as yet celebrated with better cheer, than other ordinary days are commonly allow'd? Why were the extraordinary days of thanksgiving, which were heretofore appointed, celebrated with such outward testimonies of joy and mirth, and men only admonished to beware of that *access* and *riot* which doth too often attend them? In fine, why were men admonished upon solemn Fasting days to lay aside their rich Apparel and Ornaments *e*, and to suit even their external habit to the seriousness of the day. For what are these but the visible remains of that respect which men naturally conceive to be due to sacred things, though, in other instances, they do as fondly set themselves to depreciate and decry it. I will dismiss those outward testimonies of respect, which I have said to be due to sacred things *in the general*, after I have cautioned men against two errors which are apt to adhere to them, and by the admission of which God shall be rather dishonoured, than receive any honour in, and by them. Which is either first, by setting too great a value upon particular ones, or secondly, by making use of such testimonies of respect toward them, by which we are wont to express our regard to God himself. For thus, for instance, though sacred places may, as such, challenge our respect, though the putting off our

^d Directory, in the Office concerning days of Thanksgiving
^e Ibid in the Office concerning publick Fasting.

shoes from our feet, when we enter into them, be no inconvenient expression of it, even in the opinion of God himself; yet if any man should either use or represent that particular Ceremony as necessary to be observ'd by all that enter into the House of God, and particularly, as by the force of a divine Command, there is no doubt he would thereby fall into superstition and well-worship, and so rather dishonour than honour God, or his House by it: Because though the House of God may challenge from us some outward testimony of respect, yet there is nothing in reason, or Scripture, to persuade the obligation of that particular one, to any other, than those two holy men, upon whom it was enjoin'd. In like manner, though sacred places may as such challenge respect from us, though the *putting our shoes from off our feet*, or our *Hats from our heads*, be no inconvenient expressions of it; yet the like is not to be said of these lowly expressions of reverence, whereby we are wont to do honour to God himself; Partly, because we should thereby give them divine honours, and to set sacred places in the place of God himself, and partly, because the Angels of God, who are much more holy, because holy by an inherent holiness, have carefully avoided, and forbidden the giving such honours to themselves. But as if these and the like errors be avoided, I see not what can be said against the paying outward testimonies of respect, even to sacred things; so I shall now go on to point out some of those testimonies of respect, which I conceive to be no way improper to the several species thereof.

As touching sacred *times*, which are upon the matter the only things that are now accounted such, we have not only to hallow them, the appropriating them to those religious exercises, for which they were consecrated to God, but the paying them such outward testimonies of respect, as may declare our acknowledgment of the sacredness thereof; such as are, (as was before intimated) the suiting our *habit and diet* to the occasions of them, and accordingly, if they be days of joy, celebrating them with the proper expressions of it, if of Fasting and Mourning, by abstaining at least from all gaiety in our Apparel, and making our outward garb to bespeak the inward compunction of our minds. For sacred *places*, we have also to hallow them, the *putting off our shoes from our feet*, or our *Hats from our heads*, when we enter into them; the adorning them with such *grave and becoming Ornaments*, as may hold some suitableness to the Majesty of him, to whom they do belong; but however, that may shew, that we have not more consideration of our own Houses, than of the House of God; the keeping them from time to time in *fit and becoming repair*, & *cleansing* them from that soil, to which they are as obnoxious, as other places. For these and such like testimonies of respect, though not of equal necessity to the hallowing of them, yet tend no less to declare our acknowledgment of the sacredness thereof, than the appropriating them to those religious exercises for which they were design'd. I say nothing at present concerning sacred *persons*, because I have elsewhere accounted for those outward testimonies of respect, which are due unto them; and shall therefore pass from thence to the consideration of sacred *things*, and under which notion I comprehend all but sacred times and places: More particularly the *Vessels* and other *utensils of the Sanctuary*, those especially which serve to the administration of the Holy Communion, and to which no man can think less respect to be due, than to keep them decent and splendid

splendid ; but above all the Books of the *sacred Scriptures*, the *Contents* of those Books, and the *Papers* wherein they are described. For who can think less respect to be due to the former of these, than to avoid the applying the several Sentences thereof to ludicrous purposes, and by which those Books and the Religion which they contain, is not seldom brought into contempt ? Nay, who can think less respect to be due to them, than to mention them always with that regard, which is due to the suggestions and writings of men inspired by the holy Ghost ? For whatever may be said of other sacred things, these are made such by God himself, and cannot therefore be either dishonoured or disregarded, without shewing the like disesteem of him from whom they proceeded. And though the like be not to be said of those Books and Papers, wherein the dictates of holy men, or rather of the Holy Ghost, are described : yet as a thing may become holy by being set apart by men, as well as by being consecrated by God ; so when once those Books and Papers come to have the divine dictates imprinted on them, they pass from that common and ordinary condition, wherein they before were, to a more peculiar and separate one, and which may therefore well challenge from us as peculiar a regard. Which our Church and Nation chuseth to express by the kissing of them in the administration of an Oath, and which all men at all times do so far concur in, as carefully to avoid the shewing to them any outward testimony of disrespect. Though why they, who do so, should not upon occasion think themselves equally concern'd to pay those Books some outward testimony of respect, is a thing which I am not able to unriddle ; The disrespect of any *thing*, or *person*, becoming no otherwise sinful, than upon the supposition of a respect being due unto them, and therefore inferring as strongly the paying some outward testimony of respect, where there is an obligation upon us of avoiding the expressions of the other. However, as it would some way contribute to the esteem of that sacred Book, to avoid all testimonies of disrespect to it ; so I cannot forbear to subjoin what is reported with commendation of our *E. 6.* by a person ^{g Fuller's} who seems to have been no Friend of superstitious usances ; to wit, that that Prince, ^{Church Hist.} when a Child, being about to take down something which was above his reach, and one of his Play-Fellows proffering him a *blessed plated Bible* to stand upon, and heighten him, he, perceiving it to be a *Bible*, not only refus'd it, but sharply reprov'd the offerer thereof, as judging it unfit that he should trample that under his feet, which he was to treasure up in his head. So fearful was that excellent person of offering any thing, that look'd like a disrespect, to those Books which our Religion obligeth us to esteem as Sacred ; And setting aside a few among our selves, whose prejudices have taught them to slight what they ought rather to esteem reverently of, there is not any who would not approve of that resentment of his, and look upon it as a pregnant instance of his Religious temper. For even the *Turks* ^{b Busbeq. Turke. Epist. 1.} have their *Alcoran* in so great esteem, that they look upon it as an offence in one of their own Body, to sit upon it, though unawares, but, in a Christian, as also Capital.

But because the *name* of God, if any thing, hath a near relation to him, and may therefore be presum'd to claim a part of that sanctification, which I have said to be due to other things of the like nature ; and because the thing here desir'd in particular is the *sanctification* of

Gods name, and ought therefore, if capable of it, to be more especially understood; therefore enquire we, in the next place, whether that *name* of his *ought to be sanctified* by us, and *what kind of sanctification* it ought to have. That it ought to be sanctified by us, we have not only its near relation to him, whose it is, to perswade, and which I have before shewn to be a just ground of the sanctification of other things; but the mischief that would infallibly arise from the neglect of that sanctification, which we affirm to be due unto it. For were not even the name of God considered as sacred, neither would his nature continue long to be so; because though that name of his be not his nature, yet it is that whereby the holiness thereof is insinuated into our minds, and which consequently would fall short of much of its esteem, if the other had no mark of that set upon it. For thus, for instance, if those names or titles by which God is usually describ'd, had not so much esteem set upon them as to be appropriated to him, who is wont to be described by them; it is easy to see that his glorious perfections might thereby come to be attributed to others beside himself, and he therefore lose much of his honour by it; Because names and titles were intended as Characteristicks of his perfections, and therefore likely enough to insinuate a belief of those perfections there, where the other shall be found to be ascrib'd. Of which yet if any doubt should remain, we have a farther proof in that title wherewith this Prayer of our Lord begins; they who took the confidence to teach that the title of *Our Father which art in Heaven* might be given to a Saint, passing from thence to affirm, that the same glorious boons might be ask'd of such a one, which our Lord had taught us to ask of God. From whence as it appears, that the names or titles of God ought to be sanctified by us, which is the first thing I proposed to establish; so that they ought so far to be sanctified by us, as to be appropriated to him to whom they do belong, and to the declaration of his nature and perfections. Whether they may also challenge from us some outward testimony of respect is another question, but which yet, after what hath been said concerning other sacred things, will not be difficult to resolve. For by the same reason that other things of the same nature may challenge from us some outward testimony of respect, these also may, especially if any such may be found as are but suitable to them. Of which nature I reckon first (what we find the most scrupulous persons assenting to) the mentioning of those names and titles only in matters serious, as then too with that seriousness and composedness which may bespeak our regard both of them and him. I reckon secondly, what may with commendation enough be transcribed from the Turks, the not lightly employing those Papers wherein they are written to any base Office, provided that be done not out of an opinion of its necessity, but only as a decent expression of our regard to them. Nay what if I should add thirdly, the sometime suppressing the mention of Gods name, as we find by *Philo*, that some of the Jews did even in the making of an Oath, swearing according to *אני אלהים*, or *אני אלהים*, yea as the generality of them did as to the name *יהוה*. For where what is so omitted, is not omitted out of any opinion of its necessity, but only as an apt, though arbitrary, expression of our respect; I see not but it may be of good use to preserve men from that profanation of the divine names to which the generality of them are too much addicted. Only as I insist not upon this or any other particular

particular testimony of respect, and much less if they shall be found to lead men to superstition, to which the minds of some are as much addicted, as those of others are to profaneness; so I shall therefore pass from thence to the recommending of that testimony of respect, which we are taught by our own Church to pay to the name of *Jesus*, that is to say, to use some reverential gesture, when we make mention of that saving one. For though I would not be thought to believe, that St. *Paul* design'd to inculcate that usage, when he said *that God gave Christ* *Phil. 2. 9, 10* that super-excellent name of *Jesus* that every knee should bow at it, but rather to shew, that men should give him divine honours in consideration of that Salvation which he purchas'd, and of which the name of *Jesus* was intended as a Symbol: Yet I cannot but think with the learned *Grotius* *k*, that he alluded thereby to that reverence which was wont to be made at the mention of any great persons name, and consequently gave sufficient Authority to the using of the same at that of *Jesus*. For if it was customary among the *Romans* (of whom the *Philippians* were a Colony) to do reverence at the mention of any great persons name, and particularly by rising up at it; if the use of that or the like gesture might therefore pass for an apt expression of the honour that ought to be done to those to whom it is us'd; I cannot but think it as reasonable to believe, especially when the expression of St. *Paul* doth so aptly agree with it, that he alluded to that custom in it, and accordingly made use of *bowing at the name of Jesus*, as an apt expression of that honour to which he was advanced, and of that submission which should be paid for him. Which though it will not infer the use of that particular Ceremony, whensoever the name of *Jesus* is mentioned, yet will it at least shew, that that Ceremony is no unapt declaration of that honour, which ought to be given to him, as which St. *Paul* would not otherwise have made use of to denote it. Only if it should be said, that whatever may be thought concerning the aptness of that Ceremony, yet it ought rather to pass for a testimony of our regard to *him*, whose name it is, than to the name of *Jesus* it self; As I will not be backward to allow of the allegation, because believing that the honour of God and Christ ought especially to be intended, even in the honour of sacred things, so I cannot but say, that the *bowing at the name of Jesus* is not without all honour to the name it self; inasmuch as *that* and *that alone* hath the privilege of being attended with the use of such a reverential gesture at the mention of it. And indeed as the name of *Jesus* was in strictness of speech the only one he had, those which are sometime super-added to it, being rather the names of his Offices than person; So it is so signally expressive of that Salvation which he was sent to procure, and for the effecting whereof it was that he was advanced by God to so great honour, that it may therefore deserve from us a more particular regard, than any other name whatsoever.

k Grot. in loc.
ejus verba sunt;
Genua flectere
signum reveren-
tia. Magna an-
tem honos, non
praesenti tantum
alicui exhibere
signa talia, sed
etiam absenti,
nomine ejus
nuncupato.

I have insisted somewhat long upon this latter notion of hallowing the name of God, not because I deem it to be the principal sense of this Petition (for it is, though the most literal, yet the less principal one) but partly, because it is seldom considered as it ought, and partly because the neglect of it tends not a little to the prejudice of that other and more principal sense of hallowing the name of God. For as it is usual with men, through an abhorrency of their former errors, to fly
fo

so far from them, as to run into the contrary extreme; so it seems to me to have far'd as to the hallowing of those things, which are the subject of our present consideration. For finding themselves in former times to have been taught to lay out the main of their reverence upon holy *things*, and *times*, and *places*, as if there had been no other way of hallowing the name of God, than by the reverence they paid to those; finding moreover that they had been prompted to pay undue honours to them, and such as were more suitable to him whose they were, than to the things themselves; The apprehension they had of this their error put them upon the neglect of them, and they did not only think fit to bestow the main of their regard elsewhere, but to withdraw it altogether from those things, which they had before over-valued. And hence (as was before intimated) their so lightly esteeming of sacred places, as not only not to use any reverential gesture in them, but to convert them, without any the least scruple, to civil uses, yea to beastly ones, to the great dishonour of God, and the no less scandal of the Reform'd Religion. Hence their slighting all sacred days, the Lord's day only accepted, yea paying so little regard to the Festivity of that as to convert it into a Fast. Hence lastly --- but I forbear, lest I should be thought to reproach mens errors, rather than prompt them to the amendment of them. But as if they had considered what respects is due to sacred things, they would not lightly have fallen into such a disesteem of them; so much less, if they had considered how much the neglect of hallowing sacred things, may be to the prejudice of hallowing the name of God, or rather of his nature and perfections: It being but an easy passage from the dishonour of sacred things to the dishonour of him to whom they are devoted, and of which we have this illustrious instance, even to those who make pretension to Religion, that they, who erewhile made no account of sacred places, or of their own demeanour in them, came at length to consider as little their own demeanour toward God, even amidst the Offices of Religion; yea to throw off (upon the matter) all external reverence towards him. Thus I say, it far'd with those, who made some pretension to Religion, and whom I will not be so uncharitable as to condemn of a disesteem of it; but I have reason to believe, it went farther with men of worse inclinations, even to the contempt of God, and the worship of him. For finding even those, who made some pretension to Religion, to pay no regard at all to religious places, yea to convert them to such uses, which they would not lightly imploy the House of any man, they valued, to; finding moreover both them and others to shew as little regard to those, who were set apart to minister in them; That, and the intimate cognation there is between them, and him, to whom they were devoted, made them to think as slightly, at length, of that God for whose service they were intended, and of that worship which was celebrated in, and by them. And no wonder, when they could not but see withal, that God's either command or approbation must consequently be disregarded in them, and, together therewith, his Authority, and the good pleasure of his will. For what regard could men think themselves oblig'd to pay to him, whose worshippers made so bold with him, as to trample upon those things, which had his Authority, or approbation stamped on them? But as therefore I cannot but think, that God may, and ought to be hallowed in those things, which are consecrated

to

to him, as well as in his own nature and perfections, so it is but reasonable to think also, that both the one and the other were intended in that *hallowing* of God's name, which we are here taught to pray for, and concerning which I am in the last place to enquire, *what* it is that we *desire* of God in order to it.

IV. For the understanding whereof I must desire you to call to mind: that as the hallowing here spoken of is a thing to be performed by our selves, so we must therefore be presum'd to beg of him, whose name we desire the hallowing of, that he would put us into a capacity of doing it: Which is, either *first* by his own manifestation of it, or secondly and chiefly, by giving us the grace to hallow it, after it hath been so manifested by him. For thus, because we cannot hallow the name of God, unless we have a due apprehension of it, nor attain such an apprehension, unless God be pleas'd to manifest it; our desire that that *name of his may be hallowed*, must consequently be thought to import the desiring, in order to it, that he himself would be pleas'd to *manifest* it, and so makes us duly apprehensive of it: Whether it be by the means of his *word and spirit*, which is one way of Gods manifesting himself unto the World; or whether it be by *proper and futable effects*, and such as are the genuine Issues of those divine Attributes which we are to hallow. Which latter manifestation of the name of God is the rather to be understood here, because the Scripture doth not infrequently make use of the word *sanctifie*, or *hallow*, to denote those dispensations of God by which he doth it, and by which he induceth us to a proportionable hallowing of it. For thus we find God affirming, that he would *sanctifie* his own name *l* by *gathering his people out of those* Ezek. 36.23;
Countries into which he had dispers'd them, and *bringing them again into* 24.
their own Land; because taking off thereby from that reproach which their former calamities had brought both *m* upon Gods name and theirs, m --- 20.
and making the Heathen both to *know n* and acknowledge, that he was not without a sufficient power, as *Lord*, to deliver them, nor without n --- 23.
a sufficient kindness to prompt him to the doing of it. And thus too we find the same God affirming, that he would *magnifie and sanctify himselfe*, by bringing *destruction* upon those that *p* were the Enemies of his o --- 38. 23.
people, and so causing even those Enemies of his, and theirs, to *know* and p --- 18, &c.
acknowledge his being really *the Lord q*, and thereby contribute to the q ---, 23.
hallowing of him. From whence as it doth yet farther appear, that Gods manifestation of his own name, and particularly by futable effects, is pre-requir'd to our hallowing of it; so that the desire thereof must therefore be thought to be included in that *Petition*, whereby we are taught to beg of God the *hallowing* of it. Only as it is a like certain from Christianity, that we cannot hallow the name of God unless he, who requires us to pray for it, give us the *grace* to do so, as well as *manifest* to us the excellency thereof; so I must therefore add, that that grace of his ought to be look'd upon as one of those things which we are taught to beg of God toward the hallowing of it.

Such is the importance of that *hallowing of the name of God*, which is incumbent upon our selves, such the *things* we are taught to beg of God, in order to our accomplishment thereof. And I have the more carefully distinguish'd them in this my interpretation of the present Petition, not only to give you so much the more distinct an Explication of it, but to let you see how Gods *grace* and our own *endeavours* ought

r In auria Py-
thag. carm. pa.
234.

ought to co-operate to so blessed an effect; the *imploring* of the one, and the *exerting* of the other. For neither can the former of these be allowed to be absent, if we cannot, in any tolerable measure, hallow the name of God without it; nor yet the latter be neglected, if that hallowing, for which we pray, be a thing which ought to be performed by our selves. For how (as Hierocles speaks r) can any man receive that which is good, if God be not the giver of it? or how God be suppos'd to be give his assistance unto him, who implores not his concurrence to his own vertuous inclinations? That therefore we may not, on the one hand, present God with a meer verbal Prayer, but rather strengthen that Prayer of ours with the efficacy of our actions; nor yet, on the other hand, so confide in our own abilities, as not withal to beg the concurrence of God to them, and as it were abjoin our Prayers to our good works, as the form to the matter; in fine, that we may pray for those things which we mean to accomplish, and set about those things which we pray for, that Author, whom I have taken upon me to explain, hath subjoin'd these words, But come thou to the accomplishing of what thou hast to do, after thou hast first pray'd to God. For neither ought we only to entertain a thought of doing excellent things as if they were in our power to perform, and without the concurrence of God, nor so content our selves with a meer verbal Prayer, as to bring nothing of our own toward the acquiring of what we ask. For so we shall either intend an Atheistical vertue (if it be lawful so to speak) or pursue an ineffectual Prayer. The Atheisticalness of the former whereof destroys the nature of vertue, as the slothfulness of the other doth the efficacy of Prayer. Words so rarely well adapted to the design of the present Prayer, as well as so excellent in themselves, that they might well enough have become the mouth or pen of one who was acted by a far better Spirit, of one who took upon him to explain, not the advices of a Philosopher, but the Precepts of the Son of God. Herein only they are defective, as they must necessarily have been, considering that Authors unacquaintedness with the Gospel of our Saviour, that though they prompt us to beg of God the assistance of his grace in order to the hallowing of his name; yet they neither point us to that Kingdom of his, by which only it is to be attain'd, nor prompt us to pray for the coming of it. By which means, they must necessarily fall short of directing us to to pray, as that we may hope, with any assurance, to attain that grace which we implore. But as whatsoever is defective in them, is abundantly supply'd by that Petition, which comes in the next place to be explain'd; so I shall therefore proceed to the consideration of it, and of that excellent Kingdom which it suggests.

Thy

Thy Kingdom come.

The CONTENTS.

What we are to understand by the Kingdom of God, which is shewn to be no other than the Kingdom of Christ, particularly from that Kingdoms deserving the title of the Kingdom of God, and from the Jews and our Saviours bestowing that title on it. A like account given of the coming thereof; which again is considered, either with reference to that Kingdom, as a thing not as yet in being, or with reference to it as already erected. In the former respect it is shewn to signifie the setting of it up, and the means, by which that is to be done, particularly described. In the latter it is shewn to denote the exercise of the several powers thereof over those who are the subjects of it. That Kingdom thereupon considered, both in its present and future state, and enquiry accordingly made, what are the particular powers of each, and what we are here prompted to desire the exercise of.

IT is *Tertullian's* Question, and after him *St Cyprians*; when doth not God reign, that we should pray for the coming of his Kingdom? or when doth that begin with him, which both always was, and shall never cease to be? And the question is rational enough, if we consider the tenor of those Scriptures, which were pen'd before this Petition of our Lord: Witness their affirming, as they do in one place *a*, that the Lord is King for ever and ever; or, as it is in another *b*, that he sitteth a King for ever; their affirming moreover, as they do in a third *c*, that his Kingdom is an Everlasting Kingdom, and his Dominion endureth throughout all Ages; or as it is in a fourth *d*, that the Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King. For the reconciling of which passages, with the Petition that is now before us, and together therewith the due elucidation of it; we are to know, that God may be said to have a double Kingdom, a general and a particular one; by the former whereof he superintends alike over all the World; by the latter, in a more especial manner, over those he designs to bring to glory, whether it be by bringing those into his Church which are not as yet of it, or by preserving those that are from their respective Enemies; and in fine, exalting the one to the possession of his glories, and executing vengeance upon the other. Which latter Kingdom he doth moreover administer by the Conduct of his Son and our Messiah, and so make him a King in it, no less than himself. If question be made concerning the former of these Kingdoms, even that to which I have given the name of a more general one, sono doubt can be made but that it was from Everlasting, or at least from the time that the World began to be. Of which, beside the foremention'd Scriptures, we have the continued series of the works of his providence for witness, and the belief of all those who have acknowledged a Sovereign Power. For when ever did God neglect to superintend over the World by his Pro-

N

vidence

a Psal. 10. 16.
b — 29. 10.
c — 145. 13.
d Jer. 10. 10.

vidence, to govern the several Creatures of it, or the influences thereof? When did he ever neglect the concernments of Mankind, or forget altogether to distribute rewards and punishments, sutable to their respective demerits: For though the design of a future judgement might take him off, in some measure, from following the strict conduct either of his mercy or justice, yet he left not the world without such clear expresses both of the one and other, as might give men to understand, that he had an Eye to their deserts, and both did and would mete out Dispensations sutable to them. And of this Kingdom, as it is easy to see, that those Texts ought to be understood which ascribe *everlastingness* to it; so we have no reason to expect any such clear manifestations of it, than the World before had, as to prompt us to think that our Saviour had an Eye to them, when he taught us to pray for the *coming* of God's Kingdom. But as the like is not to be said of that other Kingdom of his, to which I gave the name of a more particular one; so I shall make it my business to shew, that *that* is the Kingdom here meant; and, when I have done so, enquire what is meant by the *coming* of it, and consequently what *that* is we desire of God in relation to it.

I. Now that the Kingdom here prayed for is no other than what was but now describ'd, even that which was to be administred by the hands of the *Messiah*, will appear, if these three things be considered; first, that that Kingdom, which was to be administred by *him*, did very well deserve the title of the *Kingdom of God*; secondly, that that was the usual title of it among those Jews to whom our Saviour discoursed; and thirdly, that he himself, where he entreats of that Kingdom, doth upon all occasions give it the same denomination and title. For, as if the Kingdom of the *Messiah* did very well deserve that title, no doubt can remain but that it might be meant by that *Kingdom of God*, for the *coming* whereof our Saviour taught them to pray; so neither but that it was actually meant by it, if that were the usual title of it among those to whom he discours'd, yea given to it upon all occasions by himself: They who desire to be understood, as there is no doubt our Saviour desir'd to be, being of necessity to conform to the apprehensions and language of their hearers; as without which, what they speak must needs be uncertain to them. How much more then, when their own language, upon other occasions, is also agreeable to theirs, and directs to the same notions and apprehensions? Otherwise they shall as much disagree with themselves, as with the conceptions of their hearers, and so make them yet more uncertain of what they intend to insinuate. Taking it therefore for granted, that the notion I am now upon, will be sufficiently strengthened by the forementioned proofs; I will set my self to the establishing of them, and first of all of that which pretends the *Kingdom of the Messiah* to deserve the name and title of the *Kingdom of God*.

In order whereunto we are to know, that as the administration of the Messiah is represented by the Scriptures under the notion of a Kingdom, and so allowed of by the Jews as well as by our selves; so the same Scriptures give us equal reason to believe, that it deserves the name of God's Kingdom, as well as the Kingdom of the Messiah. Witness first, their affirming the King thereof to have been *anointed* and *set up* by him, and so governing rather by Gods Authority, than by his own.

For

For if the Authority of that Kingdom be God's, the Kingdom must be so too, and in truth more properly his, than that Messiah's to whom it is imparted; He, to whom it is imparted, being not so much a King, as the Vicegerent of him by whom it is so. Whence it is, that God doth not only stile him *his King* g and *anointed* h one, but interpret the combinations of other Princes against him, as combinations against himself i, and such as he should accordingly set himself to the avenging k of. It is to be observed secondly, that as the King of that Kingdom had his appointment by God, and so governed rather by Gods Authority, than by his own; so that Authority of his was given him to subjugate the World to God, and to those Laws which he should promulgate by him. Of which beside the words of the Conspirators before-mentioned, and their consulting to *cast off Gods Cords* l as well as those of the *Messiah*, (for what need would there have been of *casting off Gods Cords*, if they were not to be bound by his, as well as by the others?) we have a yet more pregnant proof from the tenor of that *Covenant* which the Messiah was to make with the House of *Judah*, and which is by the Jews m as well as our selves ascribed to his Kingdom; That *Law*, which was to be written in their hearts by vertue of it, being no other than n the *Law of God*, and by their obedience to which they should become the people of God, as well as have a right to his protection.

There being therefore no doubt to be made, but that the Kingdom of the Messiah may very well deserve the title of that of God, enquire we in the next place, whether it were not as usual for those, to whom our Saviour discours'd, to bestow that august title on it. Which that it was, will appear if we can shew the *Baptist* to have done so, in those addresses he made to them; there being no reason to imagine, but that that, which he call'd by that name, was so entitled and understood by those to whom he discours'd, as by whom otherwise he could not well have been understood. Now though I cannot say, that that holy man, of whom we speak, did ever expressly so stile the Kingdom of the Messiah; yet neither is it to be deny'd, that he gave it the name of the *Kingdom of Heaven*, and that so doing, he gave it a name of the same importance with it. That he gave it the name of the *Kingdom of Heaven*, is clear from those words, wherewith we are told by St *Matthew* o, that he entred upon his Ministry, even *Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*. For beside that those words of his were a completion of what *Isay* had foretold concerning his preparing p the way of the *Lord Christ*, and must therefore be thought to refer to the approaching of his Kingdom; when the same St *John* comes to explain the wrath and severity of that Kingdom, whereby he had before incited them to the practise of repentance, he gives them to understand that he q, who was to come after him, even *Christ*, should have the execution of that severity, and thereby shews yet more clearly, that it was his Kingdom whereof he spake. Which will consequently leave nothing more to us to shew, than that that title which he gave it of the *Kingdom of Heaven*, is the same in sense with that of the *Kingdom of God*, and intended by the *Baptist* to denote it. But neither can any doubt be made of that, if we consider either the aptness of that phrase to denote the Kingdom of God, or the Scriptures promiscuous use of the one, and the other expression, to signify the Kingdom of the *Messiah*. For beside, that the word *Heaven* is not infrequently set to denote

g *Psalm* 2. 6.
h ——— 2.
i ——— 1b.
k ——— 3.

m *Maimon. Pref*
ad *Perek Chel*
lek apud *Port.*
n *Mosis* pag. 160.
o *Jer.* 31. 33.

o *Mal.* 3. 2.

p ——— 3.

q ——— 12.

that God who dwelleth in it, whence it is, that we read in one place
 r Mat. 21. 25. r of the *Baptism of John's* being from *Heaven*, and in another s, of the
 f Dan. 4. 26. *Heavens* bearing rule; That Kingdom of Christ, which is, in the Parables
 r Mat. 13. 24. t of our Saviour, expressed by the title of the *Kingdom of Heaven*, is
 ——— 31. elsewhere, as I shall afterwards shew, expressed by that of the *King-*
 ——— 33. *dom of God*; which shews those expressions to be of one and the same
 u Mat. 13. 31. importance. Whence it is, that what is in St Matthew u the *Kingdom of*
 — *Heaven* (for that expression he makes use of, where he resembles it to
 x Mark 4. 30. a grain of *Mustard Seed*) is by St Mark x delivered under the title of
 that of *God*, and compared, as he there speaks, with the same compari-
 son. To all which if we add, that that *Kingdom of Heaven*, whereof
 St Matthew speaks in his account of our Saviour's Parables, is for the
 most part set to denote the administration of it on Earth, as the Para-
 bles by him produced shew; so we shall have yet less cause to doubt
 of its being intended to denote that Kingdom which was from God, and
 both erected and promoted by him: There appearing not otherwise
 any reason of its being there intitled the *Kingdom of Heaven*, than be-
 cause it was set up, and managed by that God, who is there. Now for-
 asmuch as the *Kingdom of Heaven* is the same in sense with that of the
Kingdom of God; forasmuch as John the Baptist gave that title to the
Kingdom of Christ, and thereby shew'd it to have been known, among
 those to whom he discours'd, by the name of the *Kingdom of Heaven*,
 for of *God*; it is but reasonable to believe, because our Saviour here spake
 to the same persons, that he himself meant the very same Kingdom by
 that which he here attributes to *God*, and which accordingly he
 prompts us to pray to him, to hasten the coming of.

But because we cannot have a more certain proof of Christ's under-
 standing his own Kingdom by it, than his giving that upon all occasi-
 ons the same denomination and title, therefore proceed we to shew,
 that that language is familiar with him, neither doth he more often
 mention that Kingdom of his under any other titles, than under those
 of the *Kingdom of Heaven*, and of *God*. Of his often calling it by the
 name of the *Kingdom of Heaven*, I have given you instances enough al-
 ready in the Parables before referr'd to by me, and that it is not less
 usual with him, and his Disciples after him, to entitle it the Kingdom
 of God, the following Scriptures do abundantly declare. For thus,
 when he first set himself to promote this Kingdom of his, by Preaching
 y Mark 1. 15. the Gospel of it, he told them y the time was fulfill'd for their listning to
 it, because the *Kingdom of God*, that is to say, that which the Gospel
 promulg'd, and so his Kingdom also, was now at hand. And verily I
 z ——— 9. 1. say unto you (saith the same z Jesus) there be some standing here, which
 shall not taste of Death, till they see the *Kingdom of God* come with power;
 that is to say, as St Matthew a explains it, till they see the Son of man come-
 a Mat. 16. 28. ing in his. I must preach the *Kingdom of God* to other Cities also, said
 b Luk. 4. 43. the same Jesus b to those of Capernaum, and to whom no doubt, agree-
 ably to his practise elsewhere, he had preach'd his own Authority, and
 mission. And he sent forth his twelve Disciples to preach the *Kingdom of God*,
 c ——— 9. 2. saith St Luke c in his story of him, even that Kingdom, as it is after-
 d ——— 6. wards interpreted d, which the Gospel declar'd, and to no less his King-
 dom, than that of God. It were infinite to reckon up the several pla-
 ces of Scriptures, which shew Christ and his Apostles to have given his
 Kingdom the name of that of God, therefore I shall content my self
 with

with adding, that the same *Jesus* proves the *Kingdom of God* to have been come among the Jews ^e, by his own casting out Devils through his Spirit, ^c Mat. 12. 28. as *St Luke* & *St Paul* testify the *Kingdom of God* to the same persons, ^f Act. 28. 23. by his persuading them concerning *Jesus*, both out of the Law of *Moses*, and the Prophets. Which what is it but to say, that that *Kingdom of God*, whereof our Saviour and his Disciples so often spake, is no other than the *Kingdom of Christ*; and consequently that we are to understand that to have been the *Kingdom of God*, for the coming whereof we are taught to pray?

II. It appearing from the premises, what that *Kingdom* is which is the subject of our present consideration; enquire we in the next place what is meant by the coming of it, and consequently what that is we are taught to pray for with relation to it. For the understanding whereof we are to know, that as the *Kingdom of Christ* may be considered in a double Capacity, to wit, as either already set up, or only in a possibility to be so; so it may accordingly have a double coming. For if we consider it in the latter of these, so the coming thereof will be no other than the setting of it up, and bringing men to the acknowledgment thereof; but if in the former, the exercise of the several powers thereof over those who are the Subjects of it. Now how far the *Kingdom of Christ* ought both now and heretofore to be considered in each of these Capacities, and by what means it makes its several approaches, must be my next business to enquire, and so declare more particularly what we ought to intend, when we pray for the coming of it.

I. I begin with the *Kingdom of Christ*, considered as a thing not as yet set up, but only in a possibility to be so. A notion wherein we shall find, that we have great reason to look upon it, whether we have a regard to that time when this Petition was at first suggested, or whether we have respect unto our own. For if the *Kingdom of Christ* were at all set up in the former of these periods, yet it was only so as that too among those few Disciples, whom he had then gathered to himself. As for the main body even of the Jewish Nation, the notice thereof only had scarce arrived at them; so far they were at that time from having been brought under the obedience of it. And though this *Kingdom* by our Saviours great diligence did afterwards extend it self farther, and gain'd upon many more than those he had now acquired: yet as he liv'd not long enough after the first publication of the Gospel of it, to extend it over the whole Land of *Jury*; so *Galilee* being the main scene of his preaching of it, we are of necessity to suppose it, during his time, to have been confin'd within very narrow bounds, and, in that respect, not unlike those ancient Kingdoms, which extend not much farther than the descendent of the same stock. It is true indeed (for what should hinder me to acknowledge a thing, whereof there is so good proof both in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament) ^g it is true I say, that this *Kingdom* was not altogether a stranger even to the more ancient Jews, neither were they without the benefit or oversight thereof; But it was then so extremely clouded by the Oeconomy of *Moses*, but was however so weak and imperfect in respect of what it afterwards was, that even in the opinion of *John the Baptist* and our Saviour, it hardly deserv'd to be reckoned to it: The former representing himself ^h as only the Harbinger thereof, and our Saviour, ^b Mat. 3. 2. who spake most favourably of the times preceding his own, dating the

^g Explication
of the Creed,
in the words
Our Lord.

i Mat. 11. 12. the Commencement of it but from *i* the time of that *holy mans* proclaiming it. Which yet, as appears from his foregoing words, was rather charitably than strictly averred by him, he representing *the least in the Kingdom of Heaven* *k*, as greater than John Baptist himself; which shews, that that Kingdom, in strict Speech, began but with his own Proclamation of it. Such evidence you see there is of this Kingdoms being but imperfectly set up even among the Jews, both at the time of our Saviours first suggesting this Petition, and his own continuance here; But whatever it were among the Jews, it was not at all set up in the Gentile World, nor, as it should seem by our Saviours own words
l --- 15. 24. *l* intended by God to be: He telling the *Canaanish Woman* (who yet ask'd him none of the prime boons of his divine Kingdom) that he was *not sent save to the lost sheep of the House of Israel*. As for the *lost sheep of the Gentile World*, which yet were the far greater number, they were both then and long after without the conduct of this *great Shepherd of our Souls*; they were so far from being within the verge of his Kingdom, that they were not so much as within the Kingdom of the Father. They were, as St Paul speaks *m*, without God in the World, and God permitted them so *n* to be; they gave him not the obedience of Subjects, nor were cared for by him as such. Other God knew they none save the God of this *o* World, nor other Prince save the Prince of the power of the air *p*, him who ruleth in the Children of disobedience. To him they erected Temples and Altars, and to him they *q* sacrificed; they resorted to his Oracles for their direction, and they followed his advices. In fine, they were so much his, and at his devotion, that they offered their very *Children* *r* to him, and omitted nothing, how irksome soever, whereby they might either atone, or oblige him. And though it be true, and not without great thankfulness to be acknowledged, and so much the rather because we our selves are a happy instance of it; though, I say, it be most true, that God hath not only remov'd the former Tyranny, but, agreeably to his own promise *s*, given *Christ* (in a great measure) *the Heathen for his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the Earth for possession*; yet there want not even now many and great Nations over which this Kingdom of God and *Christ* hath not been as yet set up, nor are they under the Dominion, or priviledges thereof. On the contrary, they may seem as much, or more under the Kingdom of *Satan*, than any of those Nations were which God hath long since delivered from it. Which as it will make it equally reasonable to pray for the coming of *Christ's Kingdom* to them, as that may be supposed to import the setting of it up where it is not; so will make it therefore alike necessary for us to mark out those ways by which it is to make its approach, and so furnish you so far forth with a more distinct knowledge of this Petition, and your own duty in it.

Now as it is easy to see, by the Character St Paul *t* gives of the Gospel, as well as our Saviour's *u*se of it for that purpose, that that Kingdom must be usher'd in by preaching the Gospel of it (for well may we look upon that as the proper means thereof, which is by St Paul represented as the *power of God unto Salvation*, both to Jew and Gentile) so we must therefore think it our duty to pray, that God would reveal that Gospel to the Heathen, and so make way for the reception of the other. For the Gospel being the means of ushering in that Kingdom of his into the minds and Consciences of men; it must consequently be

t Rom. 1. 16.
u Mark 1. 14.
 15.

be thought our duty to pray, that God would give them the knowledge of that, and so introduce that Kingdom of his for the coming whereof we are taught to pray. And though I know other means have been thought of to usher in this Kingdom, or rather (for so it is to be fear'd) usher in, together with it, a Kingdom of another nature; yet as Christianity no where suggests any such forcible means, nor therefore licenseth us the use of them, or to pray for those that do, so they do very ill accord with the peaceable Gospel of it; that I say not also with those glorious Predictions that went before concerning it. For though the *Psalmist* exhort this King of ours *x* to *gird his Sword* *x* *Psa. 45. 3.* *upon his thigh, to ride on prosperously y in his Majesty, and to make his* *y* *right hand teach him terrible things;* yet is there presumption enough, even from him, that another kind of force was intended, than that which the Jews dream'd of, and some of our own are as willing to advance; witness his exhorting him to ride on prosperously *upon the word of truth, and meekness, and righteousness* (for so the Hebrew hath it) or, as we our selves do, *because* of those blessed qualities. For if this great Prince were to be carried to his Kingdom *upon the word of truth, and meekness, and righteousness;* there is a little reason to believe, but that the Sword wherewith he was to be girded, and wherewith he was to make way to this Kingdom, was to be of the same innocent nature. Or if, on the other hand, the *Psalmist* both wish'd and presag'd prosperity to him, because of his personal meekness, as well as other virtues; it will be as prone to think, that he never dream'd of Christs using any external force, or meant to prompt him to the exerting of it. To conclude, whatever may be thought of so compelling those who are actual Subjects of this Kingdom, to submit to the Laws of it, which I am not at present to discuss; it is apparent, that the Church hath no power of judgment *z* over those *that are without,* and therefore neither *z* *1 Cor. 5. 12.* hath she any power to use, or desire others to use, external force in her behalf, to compel them to come within the obedience of it. Which shews, that the Gospel ought to be permitted to its own internal force, and we consequently to content our selves with praying, that God would reveal it to the unconverted World.

But because the Gospel cannot be revealed without a revealer, and we have not only no presumption that God will do it himself, but rather that he will effect it by the Ministry of men, *sent a* for that end *a* *Rom. 10. 14.* and purpose; therefore for the revelation of that Gospel, and the ushering in of this Kingdom by it, we are farther to pray, that God would send forth men to publish it, or, as our Saviour hath somewhere *b* expressed it, that he would *send forth Labourers into his Harvest.* Which yet ought not so much to be understood of his raising up new Apostles, as of his disposing the standing Governours of the Church, to commisiogate men for that employment, and furnishing them with futable abilities for it. For having long since appointed his Apostles and their Successors to *go and teach all Nations,* and promis'd them to be *with them* in it, *even to the end of the World;* we are in reason to believe, that God expects it to be done by their hands, and consequently to pray, that God would dispose them to the doing of it, in order to the spreading of this his Kingdom. From whence as it will follow farther, that they, to whom the oversight of the Church is committed, ought, as occasion offers, to set themselves to the accomplishing thereof (for

how

how can they be thought to desire the thus extending of Gods Kingdom, if, when they may, and when God expects it from them, they do not vigorously intend it?) so it is not a little to the reproach of the *Reformed Churches*, that, when their Commerce with the Heathen World have offered them no small advantages towards it, they have not at all pursu'd them, nor endeavour'd to plant the Gospel in it, as well as to secure to themselves the temporal emoluments thereof. In this respect far inferior to the *Church of Rome*, which hath its *Missionaries* every where, and yet more to be condemned by it, were it not that they seem to intend the spreading of their own Kingdom more than that of Gods, and which is much worse, secretly to consent to the Heathens retaining of their old Idolatries, if they will but in other things comply with the Gospel of it. Which is so true of that busy Order of the *Jesuites*, that they instructed their new Converts in *China* c, not only to speak little of Christ Crucified, yea to conceal that part of Christian Doctrine as much as might be, but to use all the same customs which the Idolaters did only directing all their worship to Christ, and his Saints. A practice so lewd, that it may seem rather a perverting of the Gospel, and indeed of natural Religion it self, than the introducing that, or Christ's Kingdom into the World. Only as our Saviour made use of the wisdom of the unjust Steward, and other such Children of the World d, to shame the Sons of light into the like circumspection and prudence; so we may so far profit by the diligence of those, who compass Sea and Land to make Profelytes to Hell, as to think our selves thereby oblig'd to be as careful in propagating the sincere Gospel of Christ among the Heathen, and so make way for the spreading of his Kingdom.

c *Stillingfleet*
Diss. concern
the Idolatry of
the Church of
Rome c. 5. p.
441.

d *Luke* 16. 1.
&c.

e *1 Cor.* 3. 6, 7.

f *Mat.* 11. 12.

Lastly, Forasmuch as how careful soever men may be in the publication of the Gospel, yet we cannot expect a happy issue, unless God give success to it (*St Paul* having told us e, that though he himself plant, and *Apollon* water yet it is God that must give the encrease) therefore we must think it like incumbent upon us to pray, that as he would send men upon that errand, so he would give success to their endeavours, and, as it is his own Kingdom which is to be usher'd in, to put forth his own Almighty Arm toward the erecting of it.

2. I have consider'd the Kingdom of God as a thing not as yet set up, and accordingly shewn what that is, which we may be thought to desire when we pray for the coming of it. I come now to consider it as a thing already erected; and with regard to those places where it is. A notion, which though much more agreeable to it in succeeding times, yet was not a stranger to those of our Saviour, and particularly to that wherein this Petition was at first suggested; It being his own express affirmation, that from the days of *John the Baptist* f, to the time he spake it, this Kingdom suffered violence, and the violent took it by force. If then the Kingdom of Heaven suffered violence from the Baptist's time, it had a being in some measure then; how much more after our Saviour had gather'd Disciples to it, and was now instructing them among other things what Prayers they ought to put up in it? From whence as it will follow, that it is not at all improper to consider the Kingdom here spoken of as in part already erected, and accordingly to investigate a coming answerable to it; so especially if we add thereto, that what he thus prompted men to pray for in his *Sermon upon the Mount*, he did long after that renew, and when he had not only gain'd many Disciples himself,

himself, but sent forth his *twelve Apostles* ^g and *others* ^h upon the same ^g *errand*, and who no doubt brought in many to the obedience of this Kingdom, as well as *subdued* ⁱ the Devils to it. For if, after such effects; ^g *as those*, our Saviour thought it no way unreasonable to prompt men ^h *k* to pray for the *coming* of his Kingdom, that alone is a sufficient proof, that it is no more improper to those times, when this Kingdom is well established, than it was to that of the infancy thereof. But then, if it be moreover considered that that Kingdom, whereof we speak, is always, even where it is established, capable of a farther force and lustre; if we consider that a great part of its Dominion will continue future to the end of the World, because not to be exerted till the opening of the other; so it will not only be proper enough to pray for the *coming* of this Kingdom, even when it is in being, but also with respect to it as such, and to those places where it actually exists, as well as those to which it is not at all come. For if this Kingdom, during the present World, be every where in some measure future, there will be place so far for praying for the coming of it, even where it in some measure is, and we therefore in the next place to enquire what is meant by the coming of it, considered in that capacity, and what accordingly we may be thought to desire of God when we pray for the *coming* of it.

For the resolution whereof we are first to know, that that Kingdom, whereof we speak, being a Kingdom already in being, and accordingly considered by us as such; by the coming thereof must needs be meant the farther exercise of its several powers over those who are the subjects of it; that being the only sense wherein it can be said to be future, and therefore the only one wherein it can be expected to come. It is to be noted secondly, that as by the coming here desired can be meant nothing else than the farther exercise of its several powers over those who are the subjects of it; so those powers may again be considered either as proper to its present state, and accordingly more or less always exercised in it, or peculiar to that state which is to begin with the other world, and is accordingly mostly known by the name of the *future* one. If question be made concerning the exercise of those powers which are proper to its present state, and which accordingly are more or less always exercised in it; so our praying for the coming of this Kingdom will not only import the continuance of the exercise of those powers, but a more full and glorious manifestation of them. For if by the coming of this Kingdom be meant the farther exercise of its several powers; he who prays for the coming of it, must consequently be thought to pray, that those powers may be still exercised, yea exercised in as ample a manner as the present state is capable of. On the other side, if question be made concerning the exercise of those powers which are peculiar to that state which is to begin with the other World; so by praying for the coming of this Kingdom, must be meant the exerting, as soon as may be, those powers which are peculiar to it, and so a yet more full and glorious manifestation of it. It is to be observed thirdly, that as by the coming of this Kingdom must be meant the farther exercise of its several powers, agreeably to its respective states; so where the exercise of those powers is, by the Decree of God, to be usher'd in by any preparatory methods, we must consequently be thought to pray for the premising of those methods in order to the

coming of it, and of that Kingdom to which it doth belong. All therefore that will be farther requisite for me to do, is to mark out those several powers, in the exercise whereof we have said the coming of this Kingdom to consist, and those methods which are preparatory to the exercise thereof.

To begin with those powers of the Kingdom which respect its present state, and which may be reduc'd to two heads; to wit, either such as tend to bring men to the obedience of it, or such as tend to the conserving and rewarding of those who yield that obedience to it, or to the punishing of those who either detract the obedience of it, or are any way instrumental to the opposing of it. That the exercise of the former of these powers ought especially to be desired by us, is evident in a great measure from what we are taught to desire of God both before and after this Petition. For if, agreeably to the former of these, we ought to desire that his name may be hallowed, as, in conformity to the latter, that his will may be done by us; if (as Christianity doth every where assure us) neither the one nor the other can be done without the assistance of him to whom this Kingdom is committed; then ought we, especially when the desire of its coming is thus plac'd between them, to think it a great part of its design, to prompt us to desire the exerting of that power thereof, by which we may be disposed for the performance of them. Agreeably hereto is the account that is given of this Kingdom, by those who could not be ignorant of the administration of it. For if this Kingdom were in a great measure to be exercis'd upon the Souls of men, as our Saviour's affirming it to be with-
 1 Luke 17. 21. *in I us* doth sufficiently declare; if it were so far intended by God to implant virtuous qualities in them, that St. Paul stuck not to affirm, that
 m Rom. 14. 17. Kingdom to be *righteousness* in, and *peace*, and *joy in the Holy Ghost*; then must the coming thereof be thought to import the exercise of that power whereby those virtues are produc'd, and we brought to a compliance with them, and with that Kingdom to which they do belong. But so was it of old foretold concerning this Kingdom of God, that we may not any longer doubt of our obligation to intend it, when we pray for the coming of it; the promise of God concerning it being, that
 n Jer. 31. 33. he would *put his Law in our outward parts* us, and *write it in our hearts*; and *he be our God*, and *we become his people*. For if the Law of this Kingdom were to be put into mens inward parts and hearts, if it were to be so far imprinted on them, as to procure a mutual acknowledgment between him whose that Law was, and those to whom it was given; then was this Kingdom of God to subdue men to the obedience of it, as well as to prescribe rules for it, or oblige to the giving of it. And indeed as that Kingdom, whatsoever it is, would be very imperfect; which should not be able to bring a considerable number of its Subjects to give a due obedience to it; so much less such a Kingdom as was intended for the regulations of mens hearts, as well as for the framing of their actions. For to make that Empire, in any measure, such, it must procure, as the Psalmist o Speaks, mens being *willing in the day*
 o Psa. 110. 3. *of its power*, as well as to pay an outward Conformity to it; the heart being no farther subject to any Empire whatsoever, than it can be suppos'd to be inclin'd to a willing compliance with it. Now as when it appears that it is a great part of the power of this Kingdom to bring
 men

men to the obedience of it, no doubt can be made but that the exerting of that power must be a great part of our desire, when we pray for the coming of it; so nothing therefore can be farther requir'd to shew the full importance of it, as to this particular, than to describe out the *means* whereby such an obedience is to be procur'd. Which we know to be first of all the due promulgation of the Gospel of it, as which is represented by St Paul p as the *power of God unto Salvation*, p Rom. i. 16. or rather the external instrument thereof, and the *influence of Gods holy Spirit* in, and with it; it being unto him that the same St Paul q Gal 5. 22. ascribes those several graces and vertues, which the Law of this Kingdom enjoins, and of which our obedience to it is made up. By means of which the sum of our desires will be, Gods so providing by the Declaration of his Gospel, and the assistances of his Spirit, that men may readily apprehend, and as readily conform to those Laws which this Kingdom shall be found to enjoin. Whence it is, that our Catechism explains the Petition that is now before us, by giving us *the grace to serve this King* of ours, as which is both the most obvious notion of it, and the principal importance of it. And though it be not to be dem'd but that this part thereof was more seasonable, when as that Spirit of God, by which this Kingdom was to be erected, was not *as yet given*, nor order taken by our Saviour for the transmitting of it, and the Gospel to the World; though I as little doubt, but that our Saviour might have the giving it in his eye, when he prompted his Disciples to pray for the coming of this Kingdom; Yet the necessities the Church always stands in of the assistance of that Spirit, and the reason there may be for the withholding of it by means of the sins of those that are the members of it, make it always seasonable enough to beg the influence thereof, and Gods either continuing or restoring it.

From that power which tends to bring men to the obedience of this Kingdom, pass we to those that are conversant about the conserving or rewarding those that pay it, or inflicting due punishments upon those who either detrect its obedience, or are any way instrumental to the opposing of it. For the understanding whereof we are first to know, that as it is the part of a King to watch over his obedient Subjects, and either to preserve or reward them; so that alone may suffice to perswade, that the King, whereof we speak, is equally inclineable to it, and may therefore be reasonably enough desir'd to do it; Especially if it also appear, which cannot be doubted of in the present Case, that he is not without an ability for the performance of it: For how can we think but so benign and mighty a King will watch, with the greatest tenderness, over such of his Subjects as yield a due obedience to his Laws? And though it be also true, as shall hereafter be more fully declar'd, that the distribution of rewards and punishments is, by his own wise Decrees, reserved especially for the other World; yet obedience to his Laws being not without the *promise of the life that now is*, as well as of that which is to come, neither can we think, but that he will, in some measure, intend the distribution of rewards here, nor therefore but that it may be acceptable to him, to pray, so far at least, for the doing of it, as may be necessary for the encouragement of their obedience to him, and consistent with his own wise determinations concerning the awards of the other World. Of which yet if any doubt be made, the following Petitions will clear it, because prompting the Children of this

Kingdom to beg of him their *daily bread*, the *forgiveness of their sins* and the *delivering of them from evil*. And this as the Subjects of this Kingdom have always more or less experimented, yea even in those dismal times wherein it was at first set up; (for we find by St Luke 1, that the Churches were not even then *without rest*, and such a *rest too* as contributed to the *multiplying* of them) so this King of Kings at length so far remembered himself to be such, and the Prayers that had been put up to him for the coming of his Kingdom, as to encline even Earthly Princes and Princesses, of *Persecutors* of the Subjects of this Kingdom, to become *nursing Fathers and nursing Mothers* of them. Such evidence there is of the benign powers of this Kingdom toward those who are obedient Subjects of it; and that it is not without the like powers for the destruction of rebellious ones, or those who set themselves to oppose it, is evident from our Saviour's proving this Kingdom to have

f Act. 9. 31. come among the Jews, by his own *casting out Satan* the principal Adversary thereof, his *binding that strong man*, and *spoiling him of his goods*; from the threats of *John the Baptist*, when he first gave notice of this Kingdom, concerning that *wrath* which belonged to it, and (which

u Mat. 3. 7. would ere long ensue) the *laying of the Axe*, even then, *to the root* of that flourishing tree *Judaea*, and which, if it did not *bring forth good fruit*, would be *hewn down*, and *cast into the fire*; in fine, this Kings

x ——— 10. having a *Fan* in his hand, *wherewith he should thoroughly y purge his floor*, and *burn up the chaff with unquenchable Fire*, as well as *gather his wheat into his garner*. Which yet lest any should look upon as vain threats, we find not long after to have been verified in his *destruction of Jerusalem* z and *perserving his own Children* from it. Now if these were the undoubted powers of Christs Kingdom, as well as more benign ones; if they were represented as such by our Saviour, and the Baptist, yea manifested themselves in due time to be so; what should hinder us from thinking the exerting of them to have been a part of that request, which prompts us to pray for the coming of it? That Kingdom being not likely to come, even in its more benign effects, where some at least of these obstacles are not taken out of the way. Though if even this may not suffice, we have the example of the *Apostles* for our farther Warrant, and who, when they had been threatened by the Jews for the publication of the Gospel of it, after a repetition of part of the *second Psalm*, wherein mention is made of *those who gather'd themselves against the Lord*, and *against his Christ*, ceased not to beg of God to *behold*

a Act. 4. 29. a *those* their *Enemies threatnings*, as well as to *grant unto them*, that they might with all boldness *speak his word*: With what design it is easy to conjecture by what follows in that *Psalm*, part whereof they had so repeated and applid, even that God *should break them with a rod of iron*, and *dash them in pieces like a Potters Vessel*. For with what other eye can we think they desired God to behold these Enemies of his, than with that displeased one, wherewith he had foretold that he would look upon them, even in that *Psalm* which they represented to him? Only as a difference ought to be made between praying against those who do only rebel against this Kingdom, and those who do also set themselves to the overthrowing of it; so the great benignity of him, who is the King of it, and who professeth to desire that all men might be *saved* by it, makes it reasonable to desire in the first place the coming of this Kingdom to the Conversion even of the latter, and that other and

more

z Explic of the
Apost. Creed,
in the word
Christ.

b Psalm 2. 9.

more inauspicious coming of it, only in consequence of their neglect of the former, and resolvedness not to be wrought upon by it. But these cautions being premis'd, and all private enmities discarded, I see not but we may, yea ought to pray for the *coming* of it to the *destruction* of its opposers, as well as to the *advantage* of the obedient subjects of it; because the glory thereof, and of him that presides in it, cannot otherwise be preserv'd, where it is either neglected or opposed.

The Kingdom of God being thus considered in its *present state*, and what is meant by the *coming* of it, and our *desires concerning* it explain'd; it remains that we consider it as to its *future* one, and concerning which, as it cannot be doubted but that the coming thereof may be the subject of our requests, so I shall therefore make it my business to shew, that it hath such a state belonging to it; what appearance there is of that states being intended also, as in fine, what is meant by the coming of it, and consequently what that is we are taught to pray for with relation to it.

That that Kingdom, whereof we speak, hath a future state belonging to it, will appear, if these three things be considered; first, that there is a Kingdom of God after this Life; secondly, that under God Christ shall have the superintendency of that Kingdom; and thirdly, that that Kingdom of theirs is the same with that which is here erected, only administred after a new and more glorious manner. Of the first of these, we have not only those Texts for a Witness, which assure us that men of evil lives shall have no inheritance in it (for beside that they speak of it as a thing future, they also mention it as containing our inheritance, of which even good men have only an *dearrest* here) but such Scriptures moreover as place this Kingdom of God after the present life, yea after the great day of judgment. For what else means St Paul, where speaking of the *change* which should be made in bodies by the *resurrection*, he tells us, that *flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption*? For not only applying those words to the establishing of the former change, but making the Kingdom of God to be all one with the state of incorruption; he plainly shews, that Kingdom of God to have a being even after the resurrection, and therefore much more after this life shall have an end. Which yet will be much more clear, if we can evidence it to be after the day of judgment also, as that known description which our Saviour gives of it doth plainly declare. For beside that he there tells us, that, presently upon that judgment, he shall invite the *blessed of his Father to enter into the Kingdom prepared for them*, and which no man can deem to be any other than the Kingdom of God, because they are the blessed of him; he represents the same Kingdom in the close as the scene of *eternal life*, and so shews it to be no other than that Kingdom of God, which I before mention'd from St Paul, and which that Apostle makes *incorruption* to be a proper *periphrasis* of. There being therefore no doubt to be made but that there is a *Kingdom of God* after *this life*, which is the first thing to be demonstrated by us, proceed we to shew, which yet will not be difficult to evince, that that *Kingdom* is also *Christ's*, and immediately administred by him. For beside that Christ is represented both under the name and nature of a *King* h at the great Judgment day, and his interest in that future Kingdom of God to be so far at least extended; beside that it is affirmed, that he must reign

1 Cor. 6. 9;

Gal. 5. 21.

Eph. 1. 14;

1 Cor. 15. 50;

Mat. 25. 34;

46.

Mat. 25. 34;

1 Tim. 4. 1.

i 1 Cor. 15.

25, 26.

k Explication
of the Apo-
stles Creed, in
the words Our
Lord.

1 Ephes. 5. 5.

m Mat. 13. 24.
&c.

n ——— 39.
• ——— 40, &c.

reign i till he hath put all Enemies under his feet, and particularly till he hath so subdued *death*; beside lastly (as I have elsewhere shewn) that this Kingdom of his is an *everlasting* one, and which, though after the Judgment Day to be administred in another form, yet is, as to the substance thereof, to abide; even that Kingdom of God, wherein our *inheritance* is deposited, and to which we before find our Saviour sending those whom he had absolved in Judgment, is represented by St Paul 1 as the *Kingdom of Christ as well as Gods*, and so no doubt to be made of its being one and the same with it. If it may also appear to be the same with that which is here erected, only administred after a more glorious manner; then can there be as little doubt of its being but another and future state thereof, which is the design of all these considerations to evince. But for this we shall need look no farther, than those *Parables* our Saviour made use of to adumbrate his Kingdom by, and particularly the *Parable* m of the *good seed, and tares*. For if that Kingdom do comprehend within it the *Harvest* of that good seed and tares, as well as their *growing up together*; if that *Harvest* be no other than the *n end of the World*, and that different portion o which shall then be assign'd to those good and evil men that are represented by them, then must that Kingdom of God and Christ, which is to follow after the present life, be look'd upon as one and the same with that which is now administred, and so only another state thereof.

I will not say ought to shew, that that state, whereof we speak, is in reason to be understood as intended by our Saviour, where he prompts us to pray for the coming of his Kingdom; because as that state is a part of his Kingdom, and so not without a sufficient reason to be separated from it here, so it is not only a part, but the most glorious and most comfortable part thereof, that which tends most especially to the illustrating of his glory, and the procuring of their happiness, who have been obedient Subjects of it. For well may we be thought to pray for the coming of that state of Christs Kingdom, by which both his name and Gods shall be so signally declar'd, and our selves made perfectly happy and glorious. Taking it therefore for granted, that this, as well as the former state of Gods Kingdom, is to be look'd upon as here intended; I will pass on to enquire what is meant by the *coming of it*, and consequently what *that* is we are taught to *pray for* with relation to it.

For the understanding whereof we are to know, that as by the *coming* thereof, in the general, must be meant the *exerting* of such of its *powers*, as are peculiar to that state; so the discovery of *those powers* therefore will be the only thing farther requir'd to a particular explanation of it. And here in the first place it is easy to see, because that *future state* as to use cannot have a beginning without it; that that Kingdom must exert it self in the raising of men from the dead, and restoring them at least to their pristine state. For till then, there can be no place for the dispensing of its rewards and punishments, for this Kingdoms manifestation of its own justice and mercy, or making its respective Subjects the objects of it: That part of us which fell being incapable of the influences thereof, till it be put into a condition of becoming sensible of them, which it cannot at all be, but by raising it from the dead. But neither without that can it have its full force as to its Enemies, and particularly as to its arch-enemy Satan, and his Executioner

cutioner Death. For the glory of this and all other Kingdoms, consisting in the overthrow of its Enemies designs; and particularly of those designs which make any breach upon their Authority; Satan having by means of sin brought Death upon the Bodies of the Subjects of this, and so far substracted them from those either rewards or punishments which it is to award them, without the destruction of Death it cannot attain its due glory, and therefore is of necessity to procure a resurrection from it. It is as easy to observe thirdly, and therefore a farther confirmation of this its power, that it cannot have its full force, either as to us or to its Enemies, unless it procure a resurrection to an immortal life, and such as shall be out of danger of any interruption of it: As to us, because *nothing* that is *corruptible* *p* can enter into the joys of it, p 1 Cor. 15. 50. and much less be assur'd of continuance in them; As to its Enemy, because, so far as Death may be supposed to prevail, so far must the Author thereof be thought to have made himself Master of his designs against it, which would be a derogation to the honour of it. From all which as it appears that the power of the resurrection is to be look'd upon as one of the powers of the Kingdom of God and Christ, so it is yet farther confirm'd by the exprels Declarations of the Gospel of it; because giving us to understand that there shall be such a resurrection in vertue of his power, who is vested in the administration of it. For if Christ *must reign till he hath put all Enemies under his feet*, and particularly *q* till he hath *so put that our last Enemy Death*; if Death cannot *q* — 25. 26. be so put, but by delivering those from the power of it, who had been before subjected by it; then must it be one of the powers of his Kingdom to deliver men from the power of Death, and consequently to procure their resurrection from it.

The next power of this Kingdom is that of *Judgment*, together with those things, which are immediately preparatory to, or consequent upon it; such as is, on the one hand, the sending forth *r* his *Ministers the Angels*, to bring all men before his Judgment-Seat, and, on the other, his *awarding them* afterwards according to their deserts. For that this ought also, yea especially, to be reckoned to the powers of it, is not only evident from our Saviour's *s* telling us, that he will *pronounce* that *—* 25. 31. award from his *Throne*, and with the Authority and glory of a *King*, but *34* from St Paul's making his *judging the quick and the dead* *t*, to be one of *t* 2 Tim. 4. 2. the principal effects of *his appearing*, and *his Kingdom*.

Nothing remains to complete the glory of this his Judgment and Kingdom, but to see to the *execution* of the award of it, and accordingly to put good men into the possession of the joys thereof, and cast the other into that unquenchable fire which they have deserv'd: Which that he shall take care for, as well as adjudge men to, his own affirming that *after that they shall pass* *u* to their respective states, may serve u Mat. 25. 46. for an abundant evidence.

The powers of that future *state* being thus describ'd, in the exerting whereof we have said the coming thereof to consist; it will not be difficult to declare so far, what it is that we are to intend, when we pray for the coming of this Kingdom. For thereby we must be thought to pray, that God would hasten the coming of the resurrection, for the farther manifestation of his own glory in the perfect redemption of his obedient Subjects, and the bringing those to condign punishment, who have either detracted the obedience of, or opposed his Kingdom; that the

x *Tertull. Apolog. cap. 39.*

y *Id. de Oratio-
ne, c. 5.*

z *Ibid.*

the same God would consequently thereto set up the Judgment-seat thereof, and award both the one and the other according to their works; in fine, that, having so awarded them, he would put the one into the possession of the eternal glories of it, and glorifie both himself and his Son in the deserved punishment of the other. For though these *last effects*, may in themselves, be no proper objects of our Prayers, and much less so far that we should desire the hastning of them; though that, and an opinion of a more near approach of the end of the World occasioned many of the *Ancients* to pray for the delaying x of it; Yet as *Tertullian*, who tells us of it, and seems to commend it in his *Apolog. getick*, was induced by the present Petition y to question the propriety thereof; so considering those *dismal effects* as Illustrations of God's glory, as well as necessary concomitants of our own future happiness, it cannot but be thought reasonable enough to pray for the hastning of them, and of that *Kingdom* to which they do belong. How much more then, when the coming of the Kingdom of Grace is equally pray'd for with this of his Glory and Justice, yea prayed for before the coming of the other? For if that be also hastned, the necessities of those, who are likely to be wrought upon by it, will be so amply provided for, that there will be no need to pray for the delaying of this, yea not to pray for the hastning of it. *If therefore* (as *Tertullian* z speaks) *the exhibition of the Lord's Kingdom, conduce to the sanctifying of him, and to the completion of our hope, how comes it to pass that some men pray for the prolonging of the World, when that Kingdom, for the coming whereof we pray, tends to the consummating thereof?* When moreover, we cannot but desire to be freed from any longer servitude, yea to be admitted to reign with him, as soon as may be? For although nothing had been here said to prompt us to pray for the coming of this Kingdom, we our selves should have been forward enough to have ask'd it of God, as hastning to the imbracing of our hope. The Souls of the Martyrs under the Alter do, not without some kind of murmuring, cry unto the Lord, *How long Lord, holy and true, dost thou not avenge our blood upon them that dwell on the Earth; for even their avenging is to begin from the conclusion of the world. Rather, O Lord, let thy Kingdom, come as soon as may be, even that Kingdom which is the desire of Christians, the confusion of the Nations, and the exultation of Angels, for which it is, that we endure so many sharp conflicts, or rather for which we pray.*

I may not dismiss the Petition I am now upon, till I have first of all taken notice of the relation it bears to those which immediately precede, and follow it. Which I suppose will best be made out by saying, that our Saviour having before taught us to pray that Gods name might be *hallowed*, he subjoins as the most likely means of procuring it, the setting up that *Kingdom* which he had long before promised the erecting of, as that too, not only with respect to its present state, but to that most glorious one, which is to commence with the other World. Only because that future state was not presently to appear, and beside, that both the one and the other would become so much the more glorious, by how much the greater the obedience of the present state should be; he who had before taught us in the general to pray for the coming of his Kingdom, prompts us to desire more particularly such a glorious manifestation of it in the present World, as might bring men to comply with the will of God, after the same manner that the Celestial

stial Inhabitants do. *By which way of stating it, the *coming of Gods Kingdom* will, on the one hand, be found to be a means of procuring the *sanctification of his name*, as on the other hand, the foundation of what we are afterwards prompted to desire concerning the *doing* of God's *will* as we know it to be *done in Heaven*; This latter being only a particular instance of the power of that Kingdom, for the coming whereof we are before taught to pray. And in this relation, if we consider the present Petitions, as I see no reason why we should not; so we shall not only make them to have an apt dependance upon one another, and thereby bear a farther testimony to the wisdom of him, by whom they were so digested; but moreover assign each of them a distinct and proper meaning, and which, in so short a Prayer as this, it is no way probable our Saviour would omit to give them.

P

Thy

Thy will be done in Earth as it is in Heaven.

The CONTENTS.

What that will of God is, for the doing whereof we are taught to pray, which is shewn in the general to be no other than the will of his commands; the will of his Decrees and Providence having no other place in this Petition, than as our submission thereto may be look'd upon as a part of the will of his commands, or as by parity of reason it may become alike obligatory to us. The same will of God declar'd more particularly to be that will of his which was declar'd by Christ, and either confirm'd, or a new promulg'd by him. Enquiry next made by whom we are to desire that this will of his may be done, which is shewn to be by men, yea by all the Inhabitants of the Earth. The manner of their performance of it, and after which we are to pray for the doing of it, brought afterwards under consideration, and shewn at large to be no other, than as it is done by those glorious inhabitants of Heaven the Angels. What kind of obedience that of the Angels is, more particularly declar'd, and what we desire of God toward our doing of the divine will, as it is done by them.

I Have done with that Petition, which respects the hallowing of God's name; I have given no contemptible account of that, which respects the powers of his Kingdom, and for the manifestation whereof we are before taught to pray. And had not our Saviour made a particular Petition for the manifestation of those powers thereof, which must bring men to the obedience of it, we might have taken our leave of that Kingdom also, as well as of the hallowing of God's name. But because he who had taught us, in the general, to pray for the coming of God's Kingdom, and the powers thereof, hath moreover prompted us to pray, in particular, for the manifestation of those powers which must bring men to the doing of God's will; it will be but necessary for us to allow it as particular a consideration, and that Petition which prompts us to desire it. In order whereunto I will enquire what that will of God is which we are taught to pray for the doing of, by whom and after what manner we are to desire to have it done, and what we beg of God in order to it.

I. There are who have thought, that by the will of God here spoken of, we ought to understand the will of his decrees and providence, and particularly that part of it, which respects his dispensations toward the Sons of men, how disagreeable soever they may prove to their own will and liking: So making the Petition, that is now before us, to be the same with that which our Saviour a spake with relation to his future passion, even that *not his will but the will of God might be done in it.* I take no delight at all in departing from the interpretations of others, especially where they seem to have the letter of other Texts to justify them;

them; But as I cannot but take notice, that our Church was of another mind when it interpreted *the doing of Gods will, by obeying him as we ought to do*; so there is reason enough to believe, that our Saviour meant no farther the will of Gods decrees and providence, than our submission thereto may be found to be a part of the will of his Precepts, which is that our Church supposed to be understood. That which induceth me so to think is, first and chiefly, our being taught to desire that Gods will may be done in Earth, as it is done in Heaven. For if (as I shall afterwards shew) our Saviour meant nothing else by it, than such a compliance with the divine will, as is paid to it by the Angels, it will be but reasonable to understand that will of the will of Gods Precepts, as which alone we can suppose the Angels to give any signal instance of their compliance with; The happiness of their condition leaving no place for afflictive providences, which are the only tryal of any ones submission to the will of his dispensations towards us. I am yet farther perswaded, that our Saviour meant not the will of Gods Decrees, when he prompted us to pray for the doing of it; because it doth not appear to me that our Saviour prayed so himself, or that strictly and properly speaking, it need to be the subject of ours. For though we find our Saviour saying, even with reverence to that will of God, *not as I will, but as thou wilt*, and again (which is more near to the letter of this Petition) *thy will be done*; Yet was that rather with an intention of declaring his own submission to it, than that he beg'd of God the fulfilling of it; Witness his premising to the former of these, *if it be possible, let this Cup pass from me*, as to the latter, *if this Cup may not pass from me, except I drink it*. For those Speeches of his shew plainly, that that other of *thy will be done* was intended rather as a limitation of his former desire, than the proper and formal object of any new one. And though I no way doubt it is as much our duty to submit to the will of Gods Decrees, as to comply with that of his Commands, and not only to submit, but to assent to it; though therefore it may be equally our duty to beg of him, to whom we pray, that we may give that submission and assent unto it; Yet as such a Petition presupposeth that will of his to be done, and consequently includes nothing in it of a Prayer for the doing of it; so our Saviours making the will of God rather the limitation of a former desire, than the object of any new one, shews it to be enough for us to pray, that we may submit and assent to that will of God, whensoever it shall be performed, the which desire is sufficiently included in that of our compliance with his Commands. I conclude therefore that the will of Gods Decrees is intended no farther here, than as our submission to that will of his may be supposed to be the object of the other.

Now though from what hath been said it be competently evident, what that will of God is, for the doing whereof we are taught to pray (for if we are not to understand it of the will of his Decrees, we must understand it of the will of his Commands, because there is no other will of God beside). Yet to make it yet more evident, that this latter will is the will here intended, according as our Church hath understood it, I will offer such farther Arguments for it, as seem to me not only to perswade our so understanding of it, but to leave no place at all for any other interpretation of it. For I demand first of all, by whom that will of God is to be done, for the doing whereof we

Ans. to the
Quest. What
desirest thou of
God in this
Prayer.

Mat. 26.39.
42

are here taught to pray? If we say by *God himself*, so perhaps it may not be altogether inconvenient to pray, that his will may be done, but what necessity, or reason, is there, that we should pray, as we are here taught, that his will may be done *in Earth*, as it is *in Heaven*? For those last words implying that that will of his is more perfectly done in Heaven, than it is in Earth, as which otherwise it would not have been represented as an exemplar of, it would follow that God's will is more perfectly done by himself in Heaven, than it is on Earth: In a direct contrariety to the assertion of the Scripture, as well as to the Almightyness of his nature; it being the affirmation of the *Psalmist* e, that *he doth whatsoever he pleaseth in the Earth, and Sea, and all deep places, as well as in the Heavens*, as indeed what should hinder his performance of it? If therefore we say (as no doubt we must) that that will, for the doing whereof we are to pray, is to be performed *by our selves*; so we shall not only find yet more reason to understand it of the will of his *Commands*, as which is our most proper concernment, but, considering what is afterward said concerning our doing it *as it is in Heaven*, an absolute necessity of our so understanding of it. For so far as we are instrumental to the will of his Decrees, so far there is no doubt we do as necessarily follow the conduct of it, as any of the powers of Heaven can be suppos'd to do. All the difference that is between us, and those Heavenly Inhabitants, is as to our compliance with the will of his *Commands* and which whilst the Angels do readily and perfectly obey, we do either wholly *detest* the obedience of, or very *imperfectly* and *unwillingly* perform. Such evidence there is from the Petition it self, that the *will* here spoken of is the *will* of Gods *Commands*, but it will become yet more clear by its being immediately subjoin'd to that which prompts us to pray for the *coming of his Kingdom*. For if that *Kingdom*, in its *present* state, cannot manifest it self more gloriously, than by bringing men to yield obedience to the *Commands* of him, who presideth in it; if the happiness of its *future* state, cannot be attain'd without *doing that will* of his, as he, who should best know, hath expressly affirm'd; Then can we not impose a more apt sense upon that *will*, for the doing whereof we are immediately after taught to pray, than the *will* of his *Commands*; that *will* of his, which, as a Sovereign Prince, he may oblige men to the doing of, and by procuring the doing whereof the Majesty of his Kingdom doth illustriously appear; that *will* of his, without the doing whereof the glories of this Kingdom cannot be obtain'd; in fine, that *will* of his, the doing whereof is so great a part of the power of his Kingdom to procure, that St. Paul g makes it to consist in *righteousness*, and other such like instances of our compliance with the Laws of it.

I have insisted the longer on the general notion of the word *will*, not only because it is the foundation of all that follows, but that I may take occasion from thence to observe, how much it concerns all those that call themselves Christians, to see to the obedience of their Heavenly Fathers will and Laws. For is it to be believ'd, that our Saviour would have taught us to pray, that his *will may be done* by us, if he did not expect that we should yield obedience to it? Is it otherwise to be believ'd, that he would have made a *particular* Petition of it, when it is not obscurely insinuated in each of the foregoing ones? For is it not a part of the *allowing of God's name* to give obedience to his Laws?

Can

Can we otherwise make a due acknowledgment of that Authority which he hath over us, as our *Creator*, or *Father*, or *Prince*? Will not his name be rather *blasphem'd*, than *honour'd*, by the evil lives of the *Worshippers* of him? Will not men be apt to think, that the God we worship is either of the same corrupt inclinations, or doth not much concern himself for the repressing of them in others? But how then can we pray that God's name may be hallowed by us, but we must also pray and endeavour, that we may conform to his righteous Laws, and by our good works, as well as by other means, declare our hallowing of his name, as well as procure glory to it from others? On the other side, is not that Kingdom, for the coming whereof we are also taught to pray, a Kingdom of righteousness and peace? Is it not a great part of its present design, and power, to bring men to the practice of them? Was not the way of that Kingdom prepar'd by the Doctrine of repentance, and bringing forth fruits worthy of it? Did not the Gospel of that Kingdom open it self by a Declaration of the will of God, and the necessity of our obedience to it? But how then can we pray for the coming of this Kingdom, but we must also pray that the will of him, whose Kingdom it is, may be done? And if we do, what necessity was there of making a particular Petition of it, or indeed what probable reason for it? were it not to insinuate, that that will ought especially to be intended, and that, as our Saviour hath made it the matter of a particular request, so it ought as particularly to be heeded and obey'd, by those who are Subjects of that Kingdom.

A General Account being thus given of that will of God, for the doing whereof we are taught to pray; it will not be difficult to come to a more particular understanding of it. For if that will of God be no other than the will of his Commands; if it be the will of those Commands, which that Kingdom, for which we before pray, enables him to impose upon his Subjects; then must it also denote whatsoever is declar'd as such by Christ, because he is the Administrator of that Kingdom. But from hence it will follow first, that we ought to look upon as a part of that will, whatsoever shall be found to be incumbent upon us by the Laws of reason and nature. For it being the declar'd intention of our Saviour not to *casst* those ancient obligations, but rather to fulfil *Mat. 9. 17;* and add to them, it being moreover so far his intention to continue those obligations, as to forbid those that violate them; to hope for any part in *19.* God's Kingdom; whatsoever shall be found to be incumbent upon us by those more Ancient Laws, ought to be look'd upon as truly, and as much the will of God, as any of those new Laws, which he superadd'd to them. It will follow secondly, because those Ancient Laws comprehend within the compals of them, the duties of *piety*, *sobriety*, and *righteousness*, that those also are to be look'd upon as parts of the same divine will, and we accordingly do beg of God to enable us for the performance of them. But so St. Paul hath expressly declar'd, that we may not any longer doubt of these things being a part thereof; it being his assertion, that that grace which bringeth Salvation, teacheth us *k,* that, *Tit. 1. 11, 12;* denying all ungodliness and worldly lusts; we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in the present World. It will follow thirdly (because that is no less a part of the Law of reason and nature) that we submit our selves to those evils which he shall be pleased to inflict, as well as obey those Commands which he shall be pleased to injoin upon us. For the Com-
mands

mands of God becoming obligatory, by being the results of his *will*, and his afflictions equally the results of it; the same reason, which obligeth us to conform unto the one, will oblige us to submit unto the other, as having the same Authority stamp'd upon them. It will follow fourthly (because a part of the same Law of *reason* and *nature*) that we look upon as equally included in this *will* of God, our imbracing, as well as submitting to those evils he shall inflict upon us, and receiving them with gladness and cheerfulness. For that will of his, which prompts him to it, being not carried thereto unadvisedly or maliciously, but by that goodness and benignity which is natural to it, designing moreover to make it instrumental to the production of a far greater good, than it robs the afflicted person of; that goodness and intention of it makes it to him in the nature of a benefit, and so as fit to be receiv'd with cheerfulness, as patiently to be submitted to. And in this sense, as I no way doubt but that the *will* of Gods decrees and providence may find a place in this Petition, to wit, as our submission and assent thereto may become a part of the *will* of his *Commands*, or by parity of *reason* become alike obligatory to us; so I was the more willing to make a particular mention of it, because Christianity is as particular in the recommendation of it: Witness I do not say only, its so advantageously representing Christs so meekly submitting to the divine will, notwithstanding the dread he stood in of those calamities it might bind upon him, but its taking care to set forth to us the great advantage of afflictions, and the kindness of God in the inflicting of them, its requiring us to be the patient under tribulations, yea to rejoice because of them. For these and the like admonitions make it evident, that we cannot conform even to the *will* of the *divine Commands*, unless we frame our selves, in like manner, to a cheerful undergoing even of those evils, which the *will* of his decrees and providence shall be pleas'd to bind upon us. It will follow fifthly, that as we ought to look upon the Laws of reason and nature as a part of the *will* here specified, and particularly such of them as are before remembred; so also upon those Laws, which are superadded by Christ unto them, because the more particular Laws of this divine Kingdom. By which means it will become equally our duty, and a part of that *will*, for the doing whereof we pray, to pay the same adoration, and the several species of it to the Son and the Holy Ghost, which the Laws of nature and Christianity oblige us to pay unto the Father; To look upon that Son, and our Saviour, as the instrument of our Salvation, and accordingly to depend immediately upon his merits and intercession for it; To make profession of our Faith in him by being baptiz'd into his Religion, and associating our selves ever after to that Church which he hath founded, and communicating with it in all those Offices, which he hath appointed us to serve him by; To beg the aids of his Spirit in order to the framing of our lives after his Commands, and willingly to concur with them in the working out our own Salvation; In fine, to observe all those things, which either Christ himself hath enjoin'd, or authorized those to impose upon us, with whom he hath left the superintendency of the Church. For as all these things are manifestly the Doctrine of the Gospel of the Kingdom, and therefore to be look'd upon as his *will*, whose that Gospel and Kingdom is; so they are therefore also to be look'd upon as a part of that *will*, which is now incumbent upon us, and for the doing whereof we are accordingly taught to pray. It will

will follow sixthly and lastly, that as Christianity hath particular Laws, as well as more general ones, answerably to the several states of men which God hath set in this his Kingdom; so the particular care that each man ought to have of his own obedience and welfare, will oblige him to beg more particularly for the doing of that part of his *will*, which tends more especially to the regulation of them. And were this as conscientiously beg'd and endeavour'd, as it is no doubt more particularly incumbent on us, we might well hope, I do not say for the answering of this Petition as to our own particulars, but as to the full intendment of it, and the obedience of the publick; That sollicitousness, which we shew concerning our own particular obedience, being both an apt means to beget in other men a like sollicitousness for theirs, and as apt a motive unto God, whom such an obedience pleaseth, to incline him to hear us for other men, as well as for our selves, and dispose them to a like compliance with his Commands.

II. I have shewn *what that will is*, for the *doing* whereof we are taught to pray, or at least what the nature thereof is, and what the general contents of it; I come now to enquire, *by whom* we are to desire to have it *done*; which the nature of that *will*, as well as what hath been before said concerning it, will help in a great measure to discover. For that *will*, whereof we speak, being no other than the *will* of God's *Commands*, which nothing but a rational nature is capable of apprehending, or giving obedience to; we must consequently suppose our selves taught to desire, (especially when the doing thereof is confin'd to *Earth*) that it be done by us *men*, as who are the only beings on *Earth*, which are capable of such a compliance with it. It will be no less easy to see secondly, by the general frame of these Petitions, as well as by our being taught to desire the *doing of Gods will in Earth*, that we ought not only to desire the doing of it by *our selves*, or by *those who join with us* in the desiring of it, but by all *those* at least, to whom God is equally a *Father by adoption and grace*, though they do not actually concur with us in the desiring of it. For this Prayer of our Lord being so fram'd, as to impose a necessity upon us of praying for other men as well as our selves, we are in reason to understand such, at least to be within the compass of each Petition of it, as are of the same Household of Faith with us, and consequently that we ought to pray that the *will of God may be done* by them also. It will appear thirdly, by the word *Earths* being taken in its full Latitude (as the opposition between *it* and *Heaven* doth plainly declare) that we are to desire the doing of it by all the *inhabitants* thereof, and consequently by those who are *strangers* to that *will* and *Kingdom*, as well as by those, who are *acquainted* with it, or are *parts* of it: Agreeably in this particular to the tenour of the foregoing Petition, and which may serve for a farther conformaion of the comprehensiveness of the sense of this. For having prompted us before to pray for the *coming* of that *Kingdom*, which, by the Predictions of the Ancient Prophets, was to have the *Heathen* for its *portion*, and the *utmost parts of the Earth* for its *possession*, he must consequently be thought to suggest, our desiring that the *will* of that *Kingdom* should be as *universally obey'd*, as that was to *diffuse* it self. I deny not indeed, that they, to whom this Petition was first directed, did not presently apprehend it to be of so *comprehensive* a sense; for, if they had, it is no way probable they would have bogled at preaching

preaching to the *Gentiles* that *will* of God, which this Petition had taught them to pray for the *doing* of. But as we are not therefore to doubt of our Saviours intention in it, because of the then known grossness of their understandings; so much less, when we find that scruple remaining, even after our Saviour had commanded them to *baptize all Nations, and teach them to observe whatsoever he had commanded them*. For this one would have thought might have been a sufficient Warrant to them, to make known, even to the *Gentiles*, those things which had been enjoined upon themselves. Sure I am, that, and the Apostles following practice may be enough to confirm us in that *general* sense which we have given, of the Petition now before us. For if our Saviour intended this *will* of God for the reformation, even of the *Gentiles*, as his requiring his Apostles to preach it to them, and their accordingly doing it doth sufficiently declare; neither can we well doubt, but that, when he prompted them so indefinitely to desire, that Gods *will might be done in Earth*, his meaning was that they should pray, that it might be obey'd by the several *inhabitants* thereof, of what Nation, or profession soever.

III. But because we are not only to Pray, that Gods *will may be done in Earth*, but after such a *manner or measure*, also, as *that will of his is done in Heaven*, therefore proceed we to enquire how that *will of his is done there*, that so we may yet more fully apprehend, what ought to be the sum of our desires in this affair. In order whereunto I will again enquire, *by whom*, that will of his is supposed to be done, *after what manner* they do perform it, and how near we ought to desire, that our obedience may come up to theirs.

That the *will* of God is *done in Heaven*, the Petition it self doth sufficiently imply; that, if it be *done*, it must have a *doer* our own reason doth equally assure us. But as we find not the like evidence either from the one; or the other, who the *doer* or *doers* thereof are, so till that be known, we can by no means satisfy our selves, *after what manner* it is perform'd, nor therefore, after what *manner* we *our selves* ought to do it; Because, as the *doers* may be more or less perfect, to the *will* of God must consequently be more or less perfectly perform'd. Who the *doer*, or *doers* of this *will* of God are, must therefore be our first enquiry, and which accordingly I will set my self to a diligent investigation of.

Now though this may seem not to be without its difficulty, because of the silence of the Petition concerning it, yet will that difficulty, whatsoever it is, be easily remov'd, if we consider the nature of that *will*, which is supposed to be done in Heaven. For if that *will* be no other than we are before taught to pray to have *done on Earth*, as our praying that Gods *will may be done in Earth, as it is in Heaven*, doth plainly imply; if it be consequently no other, than the *will of God's Commands*, because that, and that alone is the *will* we pray to have done *on Earth*; Thus much at least may be inferred from it, that they, and they only are to be look'd upon as the *doers* of Gods will in Heaven, who are subject to his Commands, and capable of giving obedience to them; the *will* of Gods, or any other Superiours *Commands*, having no place save in those, who are subject to their Authority, or capable of giving obedience to it. But from hence it will follow first, that God is not the *doer* of that will, the doing whereof we are taught to pray, that our own may be conformable to; because however a Superiour may

may lay his commands upon another; yet he cannot, because he is no other than the person commanding, lay any Commands upon himself. It will follow secondly, that as God cannot be look'd upon as the doer of that will, the doing whereof we are taught to pray that our own may be conformable to; so neither can we look upon the *Heavenly bodies* as such, which yet some, though unwarily enough, have fancied to be here intended: because, though those *Heavenly bodies* are subject to his controul, as all other the Creatures of God are, yet they are not in any capacity of giving obedience to his Commands; inasmuch as they neither have any knowledge of Gods Commands, nor any freedom of will to comply with them, though they had. If the *Scripture*, as it sometime I doth, brings in God as laying his Commands upon them, as they on the other side a *paying obedience* to them; yet as that is rather to shew the power he hath over them, than that they are proper Subjects of his Commands (for otherwise we might as well think the *light*, before it was, to become *light* at his Command, because God is brought in laying *m*, *Let there be light, and there was light*) so there is this farther reason to believe, that our Saviour intended not such a Conformity here, because the *doing* of God's will in *Heaven*, is made a pattern to ours *on Earth*: For the pattern being ever more noble than that which it is propos'd unto, we must also suppose the doing of God's will in *Heaven* to be more noble than that *on Earth*, which cannot at all be said, if the *Heavenly bodies* be the doers of it; These, though they punctually answer the will of God in their several operations, yet doing it by meer necessity of nature, which makes their obedience, not only to be inferiour to the most imperfect obedience of voluntary Agents, but to have nothing at all of commendable in it. From whence as it will follow thirdly, that we must look out for other Agents, as the *doers* of the will here spoken of, so that it is equally necessary for us to resolve the holy *Angels* to be they: These, as they are both subject to God's Command, and capable of giving obedience to them, so being the only beings beside, I do not say that are of that nature, but so far as we know, that have their habitation there. To this Interpretation therefore, even they, who indulge to other conjectures, find themselves at length oblig'd to come; As well they may, when, beside the other reasons I have assign'd for it, it is also particularly remembered of the *Angels* that they *do his Commandments*, yea, as it follows in the same *Psalm* o, that they *do his will or pleasure*. It being not at all improbable, that our Saviour alluded to that very text, when he taught us to pray that *God's will might be done in Earth, as it is in Heaven*.

There being therefore no doubt to be made that the *Angels* are the persons, by whom this will of God is supposed to be done in *Heaven*, enquire we in the next place after what manner they do perform it, that so we may yet farther apprehend, what ought to be the sum of our desires as to our own performance of it. Where first I shall take notice of the *cheerfulness* of their obedience, and the rather, because that is more particularly remarked in that Text, which our Saviour is thought to have alluded to. Now there are two instances or proofs, which are taken notice of by the *Scriptures*, of that cheerfulness, wherewith we have said, the obedience of the *Angels* to be attended; to wit, their constantly presenting themselves before God to receive his Commands, and their as readily putting them in execution, as soon as they under-

p Mat. 18. 10.

q Psa. 103. 20.
 Heb. יְשׁוּעָה
 LXX. Τὴν
 κῆρυξιν i. e. 2.
 μα. τὸ ἀκούει.
 Arab. flazim
 atq; audiunt.

stand them from him. Of the former of these we have that of our Saviour for a proof, where to give men to understand how much it did concern them *not to offend his little ones*, he tells them, that *in Heaven the Angels of those little ones do always behold p the face of his Father*. Which what can it be thought more properly to signifie, than that they are al ways *attending* before him, to receive his Commands for their protection and defence? The waiting of *Ministers* before their Lord, of which nature the *Angels* are, having no more apparent, or more immediate design than to be in a perpetual readiness to receive his Commands. And though it be not to be thought, but that they who are so ready to receive, will be also as ready to execute those Commands that are laid upon them, yet is that farther attested to us by what we read concerning the Angels in the *Psalms* before referred to; It being the affirmation of the *Psalmist* q. (as both the *Hebrew*, and after it the *learned Versions* read it) that they do God's Commandments at the *hearing of*, or *as soon as they do hear* the voice of his words. The word is no sooner out of his mouth, but it is also executed, and these Ministers of his stay not so long, as to tell him that they will. There is not among them, as is too often here, any demurring to the quality of the Command, or any stop put to the execution of it, by representing their own unfitness for it. They question not at all with God about the expediency thereof, nor yet debate with themselves, whether or no, or with what force, they shall address themselves to the execution of it. As the clear apprehension they have of the justice of the divine Commands leaves no place for any such debates; so the knowledge they have of their own obligations and duty makes them as quick in the execution of them, as they are far from any desire of having those Commands averted from them. If any of those blessed Spirits *fly with one Wing*, as the *Jews* are wont to speak concerning that *Angel* who is the *Minister of vengeance*, it is only because they are commanded by God so to do, and because they know that *slowness* of theirs is more agreeable to his long-suffering nature, than to fly with both Wings toward the execution of his displeasure.

But it may be the obedience of the Angels, though *cheerful* enough, yet is only so as to *some* particulars, or at least doth not *uniformly* extend it self to the several parts of the divine will. So perhaps we might have thought, if their obedience had been modelled by ours, and not rather, as our Saviour teacheth us, propos'd as a pattern to it. But beside, that a partial obedience would have been a pattern no way worthy of God's proposal, because in strictness of speech no obedience at all; he who complies with the divine will, so far only as himself pleaseth, rather doing *his own will*, than *God's*; there is this farther proof of the *uniformity* of the Angels obedience, that the main of it is employ'd in the executing of such Commands, as subject them in some measure, to those Creatures which are inferiour to them. For as those Commands cannot be look'd upon as other, which require their attendance upon us, who were not only made *somewhat lower* than they, but have made our selves much lower by our transgressions, and infirmities; so it is not easy to be conceiv'd, had not their obedience been truly uniform, that it would have carried them to a compliance with such particulars of the divine will, as may seem so ill to agree with that dignity and excellency, wherewith they are invested.

It is no more to be doubted of thirdly, that this obedience of the Angels is *constant*, and that they *always* do the will of God, as well as *cheerfully* and *uniformly* obey it: Because, over and above that establishment, which is given to their piety by the Election of God, and which will infallibly produce that constancy whereof we speak; the Scripture speaks of them as *always* beholding the face of God, or travelling upon his errands, as *continually* descending from Heaven about their earthly Ministrations, or *ascending* up thither to give an account of them. Which yet is no more than what this very Petition will be found to imply, if we consider it as a part of that Prayer, which was recommended to daily and constant use. For if we may *always* pray, that *Gods will may be done on Earth, it as is in Heaven*, we must of necessity suppose that the Inhabitants thereof are *constant* in the doing of it, because, if there were any intermission of it, we could not, *so far forth*, say, *as it is in Heaven*.

⁷ Explicat. of the Apost. Creed, in the Article of the Communion of Saints.
⁸ Mat. 18. 10.
⁹ Gen. 28. 11.

I think I shall need only to say, that the obedience of the Angels is as *complete*, as it is *uniform* and *constant*, and extends to every particular of the thing under Command, as well as to all his Commands, and to all times. Because as there can be no doubt of their ability for such a compliance, who are so near to the divine influences, and so gloriously irradiated by them; so the same reason and piety, which prompts them to have a respect to all Gods Commands, will prompt them to have a respect to every the minutest circumstance thereof, as having the impress of the same divine *will* upon them.

For the applying whereof to this Petition, and our own obedience, as which is the *principal* thing intended in it, we are in the next place to enquire how near to that of the *Angels* we ought to desire of God, that this of ours may come. Where first no doubt can be made, (because the lowest sense the words are capable of) that it ought to be our desire, that our obedience may come as near to theirs, as the *present* state of humane nature, and the *dispensations* of Gods grace, will permit it to do. For the use of all patterns being to draw those, to whom they are propos'd, to an imitation of them; neither can we think any thing less requir'd of us, as to our desire concerning this of the Angels, than that we may approach as near to theirs, as our own endeavours, and the present dispensations of Gods grace can carry us. But from thence it will follow secondly, that we ought also to pray, that this obedience of ours may so far symbolize with that of the Angels, as to be the same *in substance* with it, as to *three* of the forementioned qualifications. For nothing hinders our obedience to be alike *cheerful*, and *uniform*, and *constant*. On the contrary we are not without sufficient proofs, in those holy persons who have gone before us, of the consistency of each of these with our present state, and the dispensations of the divine grace. We have instances of the *first* of these in their readiness to suffer for the name of Christ, that most uneasy part of Christian Doctrine, yea courting all occasions of it; we have instances of the *second* in those who are affirmed by the Scripture to have *walked in all the commandments and Ordinances of the Lord*, and particularly in St ^u Luke 1. 6: ^x Phil. 4: 13: Paul x who tells us, that he *could do all things through Christ that strengthened him*. We have an instance of the *third* in St Pauls incessant ^y 1 Thes. 3. 10: ^z 2. 9: ³ Acts. 20. 31: Prayers y, and labours z, and admonitions a, and which no doubt the other parts of his obedience bare a proportion to. Which shows that so far

the obedience of the Angels is imitable by us, and that ours, for the *Substance* of it, may be alike *cheerful*, and *uniform*, and *constant*. I say not the same of its being so, as to the *degrees* thereof, or as to its having in it that *compleatness* for which the obedience of the Angels is so renowned; because the remains of sin and ignorance that are in us will abate in some measure of the *cheerfulness* of our obedience, corrupt the *uniformity*, and break the *constancy* thereof. How much more then take us off from such a *perfect* obedience, as may answer every the minutest circumstance of that will, which is the measure of it? It being morally impossible, during the present state, either clearly to apprehend, or steadily to intend the performance of all those particulars, which the divine will may oblige us to. But as therefore there is no reason to believe that we ought *absolutely* to desire it, when we pray that God's will may be done by us, *as it is in Heaven*; so I see not thirdly, how we can avoid the desiring, *so far forth*, to become like unto the Angels, even in those, as our own present state, and the dispensations of the divine grace will permit: Because, *so far forth*, it will be possible to us, and therefore no doubt to be desired by those, who are remitted to the Angels as their pattern, and prompted to pray, that Gods will may be done after the same manner by themselves. And indeed, as such desires cannot but be acceptable to God, and so more likely to procure for us the assistance of his grace; so the higher our desires are, so much the higher will they carry our endeavours, and consequently our obedience also; since, as the no less pious than ingenious *Herbert* hath expressed b it, that

b Epistle to the Reader, before his Country Parson.

man shoots higher, who threatens the Moon, than he that aims at a Tree. IV. But because whatever hath been said concerning the doing of the divine will, yet nothing hath been hitherto said of it, as it is the matter of our Prayers; and because it is in that sense we are especially to consider it here, as being made by our Saviour in this place a part of our requests to God; therefore enquire we in the next place, what it is that we are to desire of him, in order to the doing of it. And here in the first place it cannot be denied, because evident from the nature of this will and the proper subjects of it, that we are not to desire of God, that this will of his may be done by himself, but that it may be done by us who are subjects to it. For this will of God being no other than the will of his Commands, and which, as such, is to be perform'd by those who are subject to it, whatsoever may be thought to be desired of God in order to the doing of it, must be with respect to those, who are subject to the Dominion of it. It can no more be denied secondly (because alike evident from the freedom of our own wills, and the several methods of perswasion, which God makes use of to bring them to a compliance with his) that neither are we to desire any thing of God toward the doing of his will, but what shall be found to be consistent with the freedom of our own. Which will not only exclude all coercion from this desired work of God, but shew it to consist especially in making us willing to obey, as indeed that is the promised effect of his power, and the great commendation of it. It will be no less evident thirdly from the same freedom of humane wills, and the methods God makes use of to bring them to a compliance with his, that we are not to desire of God any such influences upon our either wills or actions, as shall leave no place for the exercise of our own diligence and endeavours. This as it is utterly inconsistent with that freedom whereof we speak,

c Psa. 110. 3.

speak, so rendering perfectly fruitless all Gods exhortations to it. But as
 if those two things be secur'd we cannot attribute too much to the di-
 vine grace, considering the great depravation of humane nature; so
 the Scripture hath not been wanting in marking out to us what we may,
 and ought to desire of God toward the doing of that will, which we
 are here taught to pray for the performance of. For it gives us to un-
 derstand *in the general*, yea the dependance of this Petition upon the
 foregoing one doth, that we ought to desire of God the displaying the
 powers of that *Kingdom*; for the *coming* whereof we are before taught
 to pray. Which shews, that this will of God cannot be done without
 the assistances of that *Christ*, whose this *Kingdom* is, and so is not to be
 procur'd either by our own natural powers, or the common and gene-
 ral influences of the divine providence upon them. It gives us to un-
 derstand more *particularly*, that we may and ought to desire of God
 the Revelation of the *Gospel* of that *Kingdom*, where it is not as yet
 made known, as by which he conveys to us the notices of his will, and
 which is moreover the standing *d* instrument of his saving power in
 this affair. It gives us farther to understand, that we are in like man-
 ner to desire of God the disposing of our *minds* to attend and assent
 to that will of his, as which otherwise our own carelessness, or pre-
 judices, will hinder us from listening to, or embracing. It prompts us more-
 over to pray, because *it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do*
g of his good pleasure, that he would influence our *will*s as well as our
standings, and our *actions* as well as either; whether it be (as seems
 to me to be the most probable, and no less agreeable to the operations
 of our Souls) by not only giving to the *will* a *general propension* to good
 but inclining it also *pro hic & nunc*, to intend the prosecution of *par-*
ticular actions, or by what other means, that are better known to him
 that influenceth them. It gives us yet farther to understand, because
 representing *love*, and *joy*, and *meekness*, *h*, as the *fruit of the Spirit* of
 God, that we may and ought to beg of him also the right disposing of
 our *affections*, and so fitting us yet more for a compliance with his will
 in them, and in all those *vertuous actions* which they tend to the produ-
 cing of. It gives us to understand, that in order to our *improving* or
persevering in our *compliances with the divine will*, we ought to beg of
 him the *improvement* and *continuance* of the former assistances, as with-
 out which, however we may for some time *do the will of God*, yet we
 shall not be able to *do it* with that *alacrity* and *constancy* wherewith it
 is done in Heaven: Witness for the former, St Pauls prompting us by
 his own example to pray, that the *love* of Christians may abound more
 and more i, that they may approve things that are excellent, as well as
 things of an *inferiour* nature, and in fine, be filled with the *fruits of*
righteousness, as well as attain to a *beginning* in them; For the latter
 the same St. Pauls attributing to God the *performing* or *finishing* k, as well
 as *beginning* the good work of Faith and Piety, and, if he were the Au-
 thor of that *Epistle*, his praying also that those *Hebrews*, to whom he
 wrote, might be perfected l by the same God in every good work to the
 doing of that will, which here we so solemnly pray that God would
 take care to have perform'd. From all which, as it doth appear,
 with what reason and justice, even the *doing of God's will* is made the
 matter of our Prayers, so what, and how many things we ought to
 beg of God, to enable us for the performance of it. Indeed so many,
 and

d Rom. i. 16.

o Act. 16. 14.

f Phi. i. 29.

Eph. 2. 8.

g Phi. 2. 13.

o 1. 21. 16. 17.

b Gal. 5. 22.

i Phi. 1. 9. &c.

k 1. 6.

l Heb. 13. 21.

and of so great necessity, that we may see, even in them, the great infirmity of those persons for whom we profess to desire them. For though we do not pretend to beg, that God would take the doing of that *will* upon himself, because, how unable soever we may be for it, yet it must be performed by our selves; though we as little pretend to beg, that God would so far interest himself in our performance of it, as to leave no place at all for our diligence, and endeavours; Yet (which shews enough our natural inability for it) we beg of him that he would be pleas'd to reveal that *will* of his to the World, and dispose those, to whom it is reveal'd, to attend to it, and embrace it; that he would implant in our own wills a general propension towards it, and not only so, but direct and encline them to every particular action which is agreeable to it; that he would influence our affections, as well as either our understanding, or will, or actions; that he would continue to us the same influences till the last moment of our life. For as these are a sufficient argument of our own natural inability for it, and consequently of the continual need there is of begging his assistance towards it; so they are equally an argument of the aptness of that *form of speech*, wherein our Saviour hath taught us to implore it. For well may we beg of God (as we are taught to do) that *his will may be done in Earth*, when the *doing* thereof may seem to be so far from him, that, as St Paul sometime spake concerning his own labours, it is not so much we that do it, as the grace of God that is with us.

Give

Give us this day our daily Bread.

THE CONTENTS.

What is meant by Bread, and our daily Bread; toward the Declaration of the former whereof is shewn, that Bread among the Hebrews denotes all kind of repast, as well that of more solemn Feasts, as that of the more common refectious; that that notion is so far to be admitted here, as to suppose our Saviour to understand all things which are necessary, both for our Souls and Bodies, but more especially for the latter, as Drink, Raiment, and a Habitation, as well as Bread. Alike particular explication of the word we render daily, which is shewn to signifie that which is suitable to the needs of our either nature or conditions, and not either above or below them. Occasion taken from thence to enquire, whether or no, and how far it may be lawful, either to pray for, or endeavour after riches, and an answer returned to it. Of the time for which we are to ask this our Bread from God, and after a brief account of that, a yet more particular one of those things which we are taught to ask of God towards it, and whether or no, and how far our praying for the Bread of the present day is consistent with that provision, which we think our selves oblig'd to make for futurity. The grounds of our so asking our Bread of God, more particularly, our own need of it, and dependance upon God for it.

THIS Prayer of our Lord hath hitherto imploy'd it self in such *Petitions* as do more immediately respect God's *Glory*, though not without a design of procuring our advantage by it; It now descends to *those*, which have a more immediate aspect upon *our selves*, and which, no doubt after the other, may be awfully enough intended: Partly, because even they tend to the illustration of God's *Glory*, and partly because nothing hinders us to seek our own welfare, where the other is before provided for. To this sort of *Petitions* therefore I will now address my self, and first of all to that which teacheth us to pray, *Give us this day our daily Bread*.

In the handling whereof I will proceed in this method. 1. I will enquire what that is we are here taught to ask. 2. For what time we are to ask it. 3. What that is which we ask of God concerning it. 4. The grounds of our so asking it of him.

I. Now the blessing here asked is *Bread* and *our daily Bread*; words, especially the former, which are in themselves of an obvious signification, and which, it may be, are made more difficult here, than there is any necessity for. For though *Bread*, in this place, may be of a more comprehensive sense than that which we commonly take it in, yet is that (because the most common and the most literal one) to be preferred to any other, but however to be the measure of all other senses, which

which may be supposed to be comprised in it. By that more common and literal sense of the word *Bread*, we will therefore regulate our interpretations of this Petition, and accordingly enquire, whether any other boons are comprehended under it, and what those boons are.

That the *Bread* we are here taught to ask was intended to denote other boons, than that which the literal sense of the word will lead us to the understanding of, will become propable, first from the use of it in that language, in which our Saviour spake, and in which as it is not unlikely that his Disciples would understand him, so it is equally probable that he himself did therefore use it. For how ordinary was it, among the *Hebrews*, to make it denote all those things, which minister to the support, or comfort of the outward man? *I will fetch a morsel of Bread* for you, said *Abraham* ^a to the *Angels*, when it was in his thoughts, as appears by his future ^b treatment, to provide them of a more liberal refecti^on, and serve them in a *Call* after the best fashion of those Ancient days. And *set on Bread*, said *Joseph* ^c to his Servants, when it was his intention to Feast his Brethren, as appears by the *Messes* he sent them ^d, and his own former admonition to his Steward ^e, when he commanded him to *slay and make ready*. *Arise and eat Bread*, said *Jezebel* ^f to *Alab*, when no doubt, she invited him to a Royal Banquet, as appears both by his own quality, and her prompting ^g him to make his heart merry. And *thou shalt eat Bread at my Table continually*, said King *David* ^h to *Mephibosheth*, when no doubt, because his Table was more richly furnished, he intended him better fare. Neither was this the Language of the more Ancient *Hebrews* only, that we should think our Saviour to have confin'd the word *Bread* to its strict and literal interpretation: For we find the same Language to have pass'd into the times of the *New Testament*, yea to have been known unto, and used by himself. For thus, after our Saviour had spoken of the blessedness of the charitable man at the resurrection, (and which neither he, nor the Jews, look'd upon as an ordinary one) one of those *who sat at meat with him*, to signify his assent unto it, and his being ravish'd with it, cried out, *Blessed is he that shall eat Bread in the Kingdom of God*, and must therefore be thought to have intended by it, no simple, or ordinary refreshment: Yea our Saviour himself, to confirm that notion of his farther, did thereupon compare the joys of the Resurrection to a *great Supper* ^k, and such a Supper too, as the parallel places of *St Matthew* instructs ^l us, as *Kings* are wont to prepare at the *Marriage of a Son*. From all which as it appears, that the word *Bread* in the *Hebrew Idiom* was of so comprehensive a sense, as to take in even more liberal and delicious entertainments; so it is not improbable, that our Saviour might make use of it here, though not to denote delicious food, yet a much more liberal refreshment, than simple *Bread* will amount unto. But beside the more general use of the word *Bread* in the *Hebrew Idiom* and which it is not at all unlikely our Saviour conform'd his own Language to, we have for a farther proof of the like use of it here, the general reason of asking of God that *Bread* which is here desir'd, the necessity, that ariseth thereupon, of asking other things which are alike founded in it, and the equal necessity there is (because there is no other Petition to refer it to) of including the asking thereof in that of the other. For if the general reason of our asking of *Bread* be its necessity to our outward support, if it be alike necessary, for that reason, to ask other

other things beside *Bread*, because other things are alike necessary to our outward support; Lastly, if it be equally necessary, because there is no other Petition to refer it to, of including the asking of those in the asking of the other; then must we suppose the word *Bread* to include in it all those other things at least, which are of the same necessity with it. Otherwise this Prayer of our Lord shall, so far forth, be neither perfect *form* nor *pattern*, which the reverence we bear to our Saviour, as well as what hath been before said concerning it, forbids us to believe. Since therefore by parity of reason, as well as by the force of the *Hebrew Idiom* there is a necessity of extending the word *Bread* beyond its native sense, we will take it for granted, that it comprehends other boons under it, and, consequently thereto, enquire what *those boons* are.

Now as there are *spiritual* as well as *temporal* boons, and which therefore may be supposed to be here intended; so I will first of all enquire, whether each of these are here intended, and, if they be, in what order and proportion. That *temporal* boons are here intended, yea that they are *primarily* and *principally* intended here, our Saviour's making use of the word *Bread* to describe them by, may serve for an abundant evidence. For though the word *Bread* may be applied to *spiritual* things, and particularly to those which tend to the support of our *spiritual* life; though the word be accordingly used by our Saviour to express *in his own excellencies*, and that *spiritual* support, or comfort, ^{m Joh. 6. 33. &c.} which we may reap thereby: Yet being properly set to denote that which tends to the support of our *temporal* life, and no otherwise that which tends to the support of the other, than as that may be supposed to hold some Analogy with it; being moreover made use of here, without any the least intimation of its being otherwise, than properly to be understood; being, lastly, our *spiritual food* is sufficiently prayed for in that Petition which prompts us to pray for the coming of his *Kingdom*, who hath in himself this nutritive faculty, and the power of the distribution of it; I see not how we can well avoid the understanding it, at least primarily, and principally, of those things which have the nature, or use of temporal food, and tend to the support of that life, which is to be maintained by it. For if the *proper* signification of words ought generally to be preferred to the *metaphorical* one, because first in the order of nature, and to which the mind of man therefore is most naturally carried; how much more ought it *there* to be preferred to it, where there is not only no intimation of a *metaphorical* one, but this prejudice at least against it, that it is before provided for, though under another Form of expression. Whatever place there may therefore be for the understanding this *Bread* of *spiritual* one, yet the *natural* and *corporal Bread* ought first and especially to be understood in that Petition, which prompts us to desire it. And indeed, as the *Ancients* n, where they most commended the *spiritual* sense, yet do also as carefully advance the *natural* and *proper* one; so *Tertullian* plainly gives the pre-eminence to the *natural*, as appears both from the beginning o, and end p of his *Animadversions* on it, and both he and *St Cyprian*, by their so carefully establishing the *natural* and *proper* sense, shew yet more clearly, that it ought to be look'd upon as the principal one. For if the ^{n Tertull. Cypr.} post Dei nomen, Dei voluntatem & Dei regnum, terrenis quoque necessitatibus Petitioni locum faceret. Tert. de Orat. c. 6. p Consequens eras, ut observata Dei liberalitate, etiam clementiam ejus precaremur, quid enim alimenta proderunt, si illi reputamur revira quasi taurus ad victimam? ib. c. 7.

natural and *proper* sense be to be understood, as both the one and the other do vehemently contend, then ought we, so far as this Petition is concerned in it, to give it also the preference, because the *natural* and *proper* sense is in order of nature before the other. Only as that hinders not to understand, in a *secondary* sense, the *Bread* here desir'd of the *spiritual* one, so I must needs say, I am not a little inclined to it by the Authority of the Ancients, and by our Saviours so carefully taking men off from desiring *q* the *meat that perisheth*, and prompting them to desire a *better*, and more *abiding* one. For, agreeably thereto, it is not inconvenient to believe, that our Saviour meant in this *Petition* to direct his Disciples minds to the *spiritual*, as well as *natural Bread*, and which though at first they might not possibly apprehend, yet he was not ignorant they would, after he had inculcated into them the desire of *spiritual Bread*, and represented it as the only *true* one. If (which is the only thing that can well be objected against it) the desire of that *Bread* may seem before to have been sufficiently provided for, yet will not that hinder, now hat he prompted them to desire also the *natural* one, but that he might again invite them to cast a glance toward the *spiritual Bread*, lest the thoughts of the other should too much possess their minds. And though I will not insist much upon the force of what I am going to say, because I do not look upon it as a necessary Argument my self; yet when our Saviour, immediately *r* after his second delivery of this Prayer, and conformably to *this Prayer for Bread*, is not only brought in presenting them with a Parable of a man that beg'd of his Friend *three Loaves*, and by his importunity obtain'd; but applying this to the greater likelihood there is of our obtaining of God what we ask, and particularly if we ask of God (for that is our *Loaves*) the great blessing or boon of the *Holy Spirit*, I can hardly forbear to think, but that he alluded more particularly in it to his teaching us before to ask our *daily Bread*, and so shew'd that *spiritual Bread* to have had some place in it. And in this sense it is manifest, that our *Church* understood it (which is the reason I have insisted the longer on it) because prompting us to make answer that we *pray unto God* in that Petition, *that he would send us all things that be needful both for our Souls and Bodies*.

Luke 11. 5,
&c.

Of *spiritual* boons I have spoken hitherto, and shewn how far they may be thought to be here intended, pass we on to those which are *natural* or *temporal*, which again may be of two sorts; to wit such as tend more immediately to the support or comfort of the *body*, or rather of the whole man considered together, or such as tend more immediately to the support or comfort of the *Soul* in its more proper, though withal *natural*, functions. Now each of these I will again shew to be comprised in the word *Bread*, and, when I have done so proceed to an enumeration of them.

That such boons as tend to the support of the *Body*, or of the *whole man* considered together, are included in this Petition, is not only evident from our Saviour's making use of the word *Bread* to describe those boons by, but from what I have before said concerning the equal necessity thereof toward the support or comfort of it. For if the formal reason of asking *Bread* be the necessity there is of it toward the support and comfort of our *Bodies*, then must other things which have the same reason and necessity, be alike necessary to be asked with *Bread*, and consequently, because there is no other Petition to reduce them

to,

to, be thought to be included in it. But from hence it will follow first, that though there is mention here of *Bread* only, yet *drink* is also included in it; Bread, without that, being so far from proving a fit nourishment, that it will on the contrary be destructive to us. And hence even in the lowest repasts mentioned in Scripture, we find Bread and Water join'd together, and the Patriarch, when he would bless his Sons with temporal blessings, wishing them the *dew of Heaven* ^f, as well as the *fatness of the Earth*. If the latter of these be our *staff*, as the Scripture ^t calls it, and particularly the Prophet *Isaiah* ^u, yet *water is our stay*, as the same Prophet tells us ^x, and we can no more subsist without it, than without the other. Again, being *clothing* is no less necessary for the support of life, and that is no where else mentioned in this Prayer of our Lord, we are in reason to suppose that also to be included: Especially when we find *Jacob* articling for these two things in the vow he made of serving God, and the *Apostle* making them the utmost limit of contentment. For if, saith *Jacob*, *God will be with me, and will keep me in the way that I go, and will give me Bread to eat, and rayment y to put on, then shall the Lord be my God, and this stone which I have set up for a Pillar, shall be God's House*. And *St Paul* ^z agreeably thereto, in his admonition to contentment, *And having food and raiment, let us be therewith content*. Being, thirdly, our Bodies are exposed to the injury of the weather, and cannot be secur'd against it by the bare provision of cloathing, it follows that a *habitation* is also necessary, and consequently not without reason thought to be included in the word *Bread*. The word *Bread*, by a usual *Synecdoche* of the principal part for the whole, being set to denote all those things, which are alike necessary to the sustaining of us. I say nothing at present, though equally necessary to the obtaining of them, concerning our begging of God those other things, without which they cannot be had, or cannot be of use to us without them; because they will fall in as pertinently, or rather more, when I come to explain the word *Give*, and shew from thence what that is we beg of God toward that *Bread*, which is made the object of our requests: Instead of that, I will set my self to consider those boons, which tend more immediately to the support or comfort of the *Soul*, in its more proper, though natural, functions, and both shew what place they have here, and what those boons are.

For though it be not to be deny'd, that the thing we are here taught to ask is *our daily Bread*, and which, because a *corporal* nourishment, is more proper to denote such boons as tend to the sustaining or comforting of the *Body*; Yet inasmuch as it is apparant that something more is intended by it, than the natural signification of the word will be found to import; inasmuch as it is no less apparant, that the *Soul* is of more consideration than the *Body*, and that the comfort even of the life of the *Body* depends in a great measure upon the due constitution of the *Soul*; I cannot but think it alike necessary and alike intended too, that we should beg of God such boons as may tend to the support and comfort of the *Soul*, in its more proper, though equally natural, functions. Such as are, in particular, an *ingenuous and liberal education*, suitably to our condition and necessities, *the converse of sober and prudent men*, and other such *rational and civil improvements*; As by which our understandings may be replenished with useful notions, our wills inclin'd to sober and useful Counsels, and our affections and passions kept

f Gen. 27. 28, 39.

t Lev. 26. 26. Psa. 105. 16. u Isa. 3. 1. x Ibid.

y Gen. 28. 22.

z 1 Tim. 6. 8.

within due bounds: This, as it is the life and comfort of the Soul, so being no doubt so far to be considered by us, as to have both our endeavours and Prayers, that it may not want such necessary helps, in order to the sustaining, or comforting thereof. Only because these are not so directly intended here, nor so generally necessary to the World, I will content my self with this brief account of them, and go on to a farther Declaration of what that is we are taught to ask with reference to such boons, as tend more immediately to the support or comfort of the Body.

We heard before, that it is *Bread* we ought to ask, and together therewith such other things as are alike necessary to the support, at least, of humane Bodies; But in *what measure* or *proportion* we ought to ask it of God, hath not as yet been declar'd, but is no doubt equally necessary to be known, both because of our own intemperance in such desires as these, and because the word *Bread* considered in it self, will not be found to set bounds to them. For though *Bread*, as being but a necessary support, may seem by the bare mention of it, to determine all our desires to those things which are but of the same nature; yet it is apparant, that in the *Hebrew Idiom*, which our Saviour may be suppos'd to have followed, it had oftentimes a farther intendment, yea was made use of to denote delicious and Royal Entertainments, the food of extraordinary repasts, as well as that of more ordinary ones. If therefore we would satisfie our selves concerning the measure or proportion of those temporal boons we are licens'd to desire, we must find out somewhat else to judge of that proportion, though we shall not need to go farther for it, than that word we render *daily*. Give us this day our *daily Bread*. For the understanding whereof we are to know, that there are but two notions which can, with any probability, be affixed to that *word* which we here render *daily*, whereof the former imports its being the *Bread* *of* *tomorrow*, or of the *following day*, the latter its being *sufficient*, or *convenient*. The former of these hath indeed had very learned *Assertors* both of old and of late, and whose reputation, as well as reasons may add some credit to it; But it is encumbered with this great difficulty; and, which indeed is a sufficient prejudice against it, that it makes this Petition of our Lord to speak contradictorily to it self, and to another no less notorious passage of his. For when our Saviour teacheth us in this Petition to confine our desires to the present day (for it is for *this day* that he teacheth us to call for *Bread*) and elsewhere absolutely forbids our taking care for the morrow, what other is it than a palpable contradiction to them both, to prompt us *every day* to pray for the Bread of the *following day*, or of the *morrow*? How ingenious soever therefore that conjecture may be, yet it will be necessary to be discarded, yea though we find St *Luke* b bringing in our Saviour, as repeating the whole after this manner, Give us *day by day* our *daily Bread*. For in truth, how much soever that particularity hath been stood upon, it rather destroys, than any way favours this conjecture; the words *day by day* (supposing that to be the sense of St *Luke's* *το καθ' ημεραν*) importing that we should not look for more on any, than the Bread of the *present day*, and therefore much less pray for the Bread of the following one. From the former notion of the word *immo* pass we to the latter, even that which imports this *Bread* to be *sufficient*, or *convenient*; and which if we can establish, as I

hope

a Mat. 6. 34.

b Luke 11. 3.

hope to do, we shall soon come to understand in what measure, or proportion, this Bread of ours ought to be desir'd. And surely, a better cannot well be thought of, whether we do consider the Syriack Version of it, or the suitability of the word *ἐμὸν* to it. For the Syriack reads it, the Bread of our need, or that which may be answerable to, or sufficient for it, and the word *ἐμὸν* (as Mr Mede hath observ'd) doth very well answer it in the etymology thereof, whether we do consider it as denoting *ἐμὸν* *ἐμὸν*, that which is adequate to our being, or as devis'd (for so the word certainly was, it being not any where else to be met with by Analogy to the words *μεῖον* and *περὶον*, which signifie superfluous, or superabounding. For by the same reason that the words *μεῖον*, and *περὶον*, signifie abundance, the word *ἐμὸν*, because compos'd of the Preposition *ἐν* or *ad*, will signifie that Bread which is adequate to the wants of him, by whom it is supposed to be desired. And in this sense if we take it, so (as the same Mr Mede hath observ'd) it will be much at one with that known request of Agur c, who beg'd of God that he would give him neither poverty, nor riches, but feed him with Bread convenient for him. If the generality of men have render'd it daily, or every dayes Bread (for so we find both Ancients and Moderns to have translated it) it was either by occasion of St Luke's *τὸ ἄρτον ἡμέτερον*, which yet no doubt was intended to answer the *σήμερον* in St Matthew, or, as I rather think, because they deem'd it no inconvenient expression of that moderate proportion, which we have said the word *ἐμὸν* to import; daily or every dayes Bread being no improper expression for that, which is of a more moderate nature, because few are either so abounding in wealth, or so vain, if they were, as to fare sumptuously every day.

This being the true notion of the word we render daily, it will not be difficult for us to define in what measure and proportion the good things of this World may be desired, and prayed for by us. For thus much is evident from the former notion, that we ought to content ourselves with praying, that God would give us such a portion of them, as may be sufficient or convenient for us. All the difficulty will be, what ought to be look'd upon as sufficient; which yet will appear far less, by the account which Agur hath given of it, and particularly by his placing it between poverty and riches. For that disposition of his persuades, that it consists in a mean between those two, and that as it hath nothing of the necessities of the one, so neither of the superfluities of the other. But from thence it will follow first, which will bring us yet nearer to the due understanding of it, that we are not to look upon that as sufficient, which will just suffice to maintain our being (for a very poor estate may be so far forth sufficient) but what will at least, suffice to maintain us in it, with some tolerable satisfaction, and comfort. Though if we had not the Authority of Agur to confirm us in that notion of it, there want not other proofs, and such as our own reason, yea this very Prayer will lead us to the observation of. For beside, that man is one of the noblest of God's Creatures, and in that regard therefore not to be thought to be deny'd the desire of that, which God generally vouchsafeth to all inferiour beings; if he have not a comfortable subsistence, he cannot but be much lett and hindred in the exercise even of religious actions; Penury and want naturally enfeebling the mind, and making it either wholly unapt for any generous undertakings, or occasion-

ing

ing it to move on slowly in the prosecution of them. Again, penury and want being, as the same *Agur* intimates, a strong temptation to *stealth*, and to all other unjust and ungodly actions, it cannot but be deemed reasonable (especially being afterwards taught to pray, that God would *not lead us into temptation*) to desire of God a freedom from that, by giving us that *Bread* which may be *convenient* for us. Thus far therefore we may be sure, we are within the compass of that which is *sufficient*, when we desire no more of God, than what may suffice to maintain our being, with some tolerable satisfaction, and comfort. It will be no less evident, *secondly*, that as such a subsistence as that may be look'd upon as within that *sufficiency*, which we are here taught to beg of God, so such a farther addition thereto, as may enable us to afford the like subsistence to those who depend upon us, and whom, by the Laws of God, and nature, we ought to make provision for. For beside that that is *in part* enforced by the *general* tenour of the Petition it self, as which leads us to concern our selves for the subsistence of others, as well as for our own; So far as we our selves are concern'd to provide for others, so far, at least, it will be but our duty to beg of God such a subsistence, as may enable us to perform that duty to them. For if it be incumbent upon us to make provision for others, it must be alike incumbent upon us to beg such an addition to our own subsistence, as may enable us to provide for them out of it. But from thence it will also follow, that *private* persons may, without any derogation to the intendment of this Petition, beg of God such a portion of outward things, as may serve to maintain their respective Families, and *publick* persons, such a one, as may enable them, not only to maintain their several dependants, but provide for the welfare of all those, who are committed to their charge: Because as both the one and the other are oblig'd to provide for those, who are of their respective Families and dependancies, so the latter are moreover to take care, especially if they be invested with supreme Authority, to maintain their several subjects in those good things they are possess'd of, and both encourage and reward their due obedience to them. It is to be observed *thirdly*, that as it is not unlawful for us to desire such addition to our own subsistence, as may enable us to afford the like to those that depend upon us, so neither to desire it in such a proportion, as may answer that *condition* of life, wherein God hath been pleas'd to place us. For beside that publick persons cannot otherwise maintain that Authority and reputation, which is necessary to procure both respect and obedience from those who are committed to their charge; There is this farther reason both for publick and private persons begging of God such a suitable provision, that it is manifestly his will and pleasure that there should be distinction of degrees in the World, and that what may be a comfortable support to one of a low degree, cannot be look'd upon as such to him who is of a higher one. For if it be God's will and pleasure that there should be a distinction of degrees, we may presume that it is also his mind, that we should pray for the preservation of them, and consequently for such a provision as is but suitable to them, and to those whom he hath preferred to them. How much more then, if what is a comfortable support to those, who are of a lower rank, cannot be look'd upon as such to them, who are of a higher one? Which that it is not, is evident from the different education, and dignity, of those who are so highly advanced;

advanced; the former whereof as it will prompt them to higher enjoyments, and so make them less contented with lower ones; so the latter will become vile, and even ridiculous without them, and therefore be far from affording any tolerable comfort to them. Only as even those comforts, which are but suitable to the simple desires of nature, ought to be submitted to the glory of God's *name*, and *Kingdom*, and *will*, as the precedency that is here given them shews, and much more St Paul's making it a necessary part of contentment to acquiesce in *whatsoever* g Phi. 4. 11. *estate* we are, so there is far greater reason to presume the same of such comforts and satisfactions, as are rather required by our state and condition, than by the simple desires of humane nature: Because though the want, even of these, may be irksome, yet they are not to that degree which those other comforts are, but which yet ought to be submitted to the divine will and pleasure. Though therefore there may be place for the desire even of such *sufficient* food, as may answer that state of life wherein we are, yet with a more than ordinary deference to the will and pleasure of the Almighty, as to which all such things as these ought to be submitted by us, with all the clearness and cheerfulness imaginable. I say nothing at present (though that be equally true) of our submitting both the one and the other comforts to the welfare of our better part, both because I have elsewhere *b* said it, and because *b* the glory of God, to which I have said we ought to subject them, requires such a submission from us, as which is more promoted by our spiritual, than temporal welfare. But I may not omit to add, our not being over-forward in particularizing those boons, which we deem to be but congruous to that state of life wherein we are; because as our desires will be apt enough to blind our judgments, and make us look upon that as but *sufficient*, which is indeed an *excess*; so because he, to whom we pray, and to whom it belongeth to dispose it, is both a better Judge of what is sufficient for us, and ready enough to give it to us without our nomination of it. But as if these cautions be observed, I see not any reason why we may not extend our *daily Bread*, even to such as is agreeable to our particular states, so beyond that no doubt we ought not to extend our desires and Prayers, as for which we have not only no warrant here, but a tacit prohibition also; He who teacheth us to pray for *sufficient Bread*, *eo ipso* forbidding us to pray for that which is *more* than such, because, as we learn from *Agur*, *sufficiency* is equally estranged from *riches*, and *poverty*, and, equally destroyed by them.

This being the nature of that *Bread*, and *daily Bread*, which is the subject of that Petition which is before us, I should now go on to enquire for *what time* we are to ask it, were it not that I foresee an *objection* that may be made against the other, and such as seems scarce possible to be assailed. For not to say, because the practice of the generality is too often contrary to their duty, that most of them, who beg of God no more than *sufficient Bread*, do yet use all means imaginable to procure to themselves the *superfluous* one; Even the industry of the more sober and religious seems as directly contrary to it, because travelling (and, as they think allowably enough) to add to their before sufficient Fortunes. And there is this to justify that travail of theirs, that as *riches* are represented even, by the Scripture, as the *blessing* of *God*, so God doth oftentimes, in the prosecution of their respective callings

lings, open to men a way to acquire them, and in a manner invite their diligence to pursue them. For how, supposing that, can they forbear to pursue them, either by their endeavours, or Prayers, or at least so far (which is all one with praying but for *superfluous* Bread) as to beg of God to prosper them in their pursuit? And yet, if they so act and pray, how is that reconcileable with praying but for *sufficient* only, nay what is there that can be more contrary to it? Shall we say in answer to it, that *riches* are no less in truth, than in the account of men, the *blessing of God*, and that they may be lawfully enough enjoy'd, where God shall be pleased to offer them? This I grant is true enough, but little to the purpose, because our question is only, whether they may be lawfully sought; or prayed for, and of which we have not only no just presumption from the Scripture, but rather a disallowance of it. Otherwise God would never have given them to men, because they *did not ask them*, as we find he sometime did to *Solomon*. Shall we then say, that, though men may not either seek, or pray for riches, as to the bettering their own subsistence by them, yet nothing hinders their both seeking and praying for them, that they may be the more liberal of their fortunes to others? This I grant is both more allowable in it self, and less inconsistent with the present Petition, because all we are here directed to, seems to be the confining our desires, *for our selves*, to that *Bread* which is *sufficient* for us; Whereas the former travail and Prayer is a travail and Prayer of love, and for those, whose concernments we ought to travail for, as our own. But as there is so much temptation in riches, as to draw men off from such thoughts as these, to the intening of their own interest, and that charitable design, therefore hardly an allowable ground of such a Prayer; so I see not how it is consistent with this Petition of our Lord, especially if we take in the words of *Agur* as a Comment on it. For both the one and the other prompting us to pray for no other than *sufficient* Bread, and the latter to deprecate *riches*, as well as to pray for the other, yea to deprecate riches without any limitation whatsoever; what reason is there to believe, but that it was the design of our blessed *Saviour* to confine our whole desires to that which is but *sufficient* for us? Especially, when that charitable design, whereof we speak, may as well, and, no doubt, more safely be compassed, by praying (as we always do, or should do, when we repeat this Petition) that God would give others, as well as our selves, that *sufficient* Bread whereof we speak. For this we may pray for, and effectually enough, in the behalf of others, without desiring to become the dispensers of Gods gifts unto them, and of which (such is our love to riches) we are too often very unfaithful ones. Besides if there be any necessity, as I willingly grant there is, of praying for such a portion of Bread, that we may be charitable thereof to others; yet, as there is no necessity, in order thereunto, to pray for riches, because men (as our *Saviour* sometime spake) may give of their

k Luke 21. 4. *penury* k, as well as of their *abundance*; so nothing hinders us to include that lesser charity in *sufficient* Bread, as it was before explained by us: Because we did not so confine it, as to tie it to such a *sufficiency* as might answer our own only needs, but to such a one as might moreover enable us to contribute to the subsistence of those that depend upon us, and so among the rest, to those poor that may stand in need of us. But let us suppose there were more in this charitable pretence, than we have hitherto

thereto been able to discover, and which may so far forth licente our pursuit of riches, and our Prayers thereupon that God would prosper us in it. Yet what is that to those who aim *meerly* at the enlargement of their own Fortunes, or if not *meerly*, and *only*, yet at *that*, together with the *other*? Shall we say that such a design, and those Prayers that are pursuant of it, are utterly unlawful, and that men, when they have once attain'd a sufficiency, ought to acquiesce in it? I, for my part, dare not say so, nor will; as for other reasons, so for this especially, because the publick weal depends, in a great measure, upon such enlargements, and the endeavours after them. But I must say withal, that they have dealt most securely for themselves, and most agreeably to the intention of this Petition, who have satisfied themselves with that sufficiency they have attain'd. I say farther, that though the design of mens improving their Estates beyond a sufficiency, be not lawful in it self, nor yet those Prayers that are made to God in pursuance of it; Yet I conceive it to become lawful rather by the invitation of the divine providence, whensoever that shall offer it, than by our own voluntary desiring, or seeking after it: Because he, who hath taught us to pray hath confin'd us to such desires, as have only a sufficiency for their object. By which means, the only difficulty we have to incounter with, will be the consistency of mens desires, so circumstantiated, and occasion'd, with those limits which are here set them by our Saviour. And indeed, if *that* be the only thing we look after, neither do we upon any other account pray and endeavour after riches, than as we shall find a fair invitation from the will of the divine providence to pursue them, and beg of God his blessing in the pursuit of them, so I should not at all doubt, but we may easily reconcile that desire, and endeavour, with this more limited and bounded one: because being before taught to pray, that God's *will* may have a due compliance from us, and particularly that part of it which leads us to a compliance with the *will* of his *providence*, we must consequently be thought to be so far forth only confin'd to the desire of *sufficient* Bread, as not to desire any other but of our own proper motion, nor, where it doth not appear to us, that it is the will and pleasure of him (to whom the gift of *riches* appertaineth) to bestow those riches on us. Which as it is no way inconsistent with that desire and endeavour, which is excited by the will of the divine providence, and therefore ought not to be look'd upon as any way prejudicial to it, nor that again, as any way prejudicial to our desire of sufficient Bread; so other desire of riches, than that which is so excited, seems to me to be neither consistent with the subject matter of this Petition, nor for the convenience of those who give entertainment to it: There being so much of temptation in them to pride and wantonness, and such cares and fears perpetually attending on them, that he, who shall duly consider it, will hardly need any incitement from our Saviour, to desire only that, which may be found to be *sufficient* for him.

II. I have given an account of that *good* which we are taught to desire, I have shewn of what *nature* it is, and in what *measure* and *proportion* we are to ask it; I come now to enquire for what *time* we are to desire it, which (if we may believe St *Matthew's* account of this Petition) is the *present time*, yea the *day* of our asking of it. A circumstance, as some have observed, which *Agur* took no notice of, and

Mat. 6. 11.

which as it doth yet more circumscribe our desires of Earthly things, so may seem to have been the peculiar admonition of our Saviour. It is true indeed, this admonition of his seems not so clear in St *Luke's* account of it, but to be sure it is not such in our *Translation* of it, because prompting us to pray, *Give us day by day our daily Bread*. For that may seem to licence our looking, not only beyond the present day, but to the utmost period of our lives, and to each of those days in them, which God shall be pleas'd to allot unto us. It is not my intention to affirm, because I know it is so us'd by St *Luke* himself ⁱⁿ elsewhere, that the Greek *καὶ ἡμεῖς*, simply and absolutely considered, is no proper expression for *day by day*. But I say *first*, that, though those words should be so us'd here, yet it would follow even from thence, that we ought not to beg a greater proportion for any *one* day, than the Bread of *that* day, and consequently no more for *that* day wherein we beg it, than what is suitable to it. All that it can be thought to denote farther than the *present* day, is, that we may pray, even upon the *present* day, that God would give us the Bread of the following ones, whensoever those following ones shall arrive. Which though it be something more than St *Matthew's* *οἷμα*, or *this* day, will be found to amount unto, yet approacheth very near to it. I say *secondly*, that though the Greek *καὶ ἡμεῖς*, simply and absolutely considered, may properly enough be rendred *day by day*, yet is there no reason at all to take it in that sense here, but rather as of the same sense and importance with St *Matthew's* *οἷμα*, or *this* day. And I alledge for my so understanding of it, not only St *Matthew's* making use of the word *οἷμα* to express the sense of our Saviour's words, but moreover the both possibility and aptness of St *Luke's* expression to denote the very same thing. For St *Matthew* being a person, who equally understood our Saviour's words, and was equally assisted by the Holy Ghost in the delivery thereof; making use moreover of an expression, which cannot be brought to the proper sense of St *Luke's* words, how ever those of St *Luke* may be brought to his; It will be but reasonable, in order to the agreeing of St *Luke* and him, to bring St *Luke's* expression to his, if we can find any reason to believe, that it is both capable of, and apt enough to denote the genuine sense of it. Which that it is, will appear first from the known signification of the word *καὶ ἡμεῖς*, which is manifestly derived from it, and which signifies no other than him, who, as the *Latines* speak, *in diem vivit*, takes no thought of any day but the present, or, as we our selves express it, *lives from hand to mouth*. For by the same reason, that the word *καὶ ἡμεῖς* denotes one, who looks no farther than the present day, the words *καὶ ἡμεῖς*, from whence it is manifestly deduced, may be proper enough to express the present, or instant day. But this is not all we have to shew, that the words of St *Luke* are proper enough to denote the same thing which was expressed by St *Matthew*. For it is to be observed farther, that as the words *καὶ ἡμεῖς* may signify *according to the day*, as well as *day by day*, or *through every one* (even as *κατὰ τὴν*, or *κατὰ τὸν δὲ τῆς* is as much, in our language, as *according to*, or *after such*, or *such a particular manner*) so the Particle *καί*, which is prefixed to it, but which is not ordinarily taken notice of, will yet more confirm that interpretation of it. For that (as is sufficiently known) being as much as *et* or *quod*, and made use of as a limitation of what was before more generally affirm'd,

we

we cannot well give a more apt sense of the words *το καὶ ἡμεῖς*, than according to, or agreeable to the day; so determining that more general Petition of *Give us sufficient Bread*, to that particular portion of it, which is answerable to the necessities of the day, even that which we beg it on. Not that there is any absolute necessity of restraining it to that particular day, but that, as we cannot more properly understand it of any other, so we are in a manner determin'd to it by the *οὐκ ἔστιν* in St. Matthew, as with whose account of this Petition it will not otherwise accord. To all which if we add, that he, who teacheth us to pray (in his Sermon on the Mount) *Give us this day our daily Bread*, doth in the very same Sermon, and Chapter too, forbid us to take any thought for the morrow; so we cannot well doubt of affixing the sense we speak of to those words which are now under consideration. For how should we think our selves licensed to pray for the Bread of all our following days, who are so strictly forbidden to be careful even for the morrow, yea commanded to let that morrow take care for the things of it self? The result of the premises is this: As we are compos'd of a Body, as well as a Soul and without the tolerable condition whereof we our selves cannot be well at ease, so it is not unlawful for us to beg of God that Bread, by which it is to be sustained and comforted; But yet so, that, as we aim not at any more than what is sufficient, so we content our selves with desiring that which may answer the necessities of the present day: By that means giving a proof of our dependance upon God for the future, and laying upon our selves a like necessity of every day imploring his bounty, in order to the sustentation of our lives. For how can we forbear the depending upon God for the future, concerning whose goodness to us and care over us we are so abundantly assur'd? Or how better, or indeed any other way express that dependance, considering God's confining our desires to the Bread of the present day, than by asking no more of him with relation to our temporal life, than what our present, and instant necessities shall require? For were it not to satisfy the pure desires of nature, and the acknowledgment we make, even by our Prayers, of our expecting all good things from God, it would hardly be allowable in us, so much as to ask any thing of him, of whose goodness we are so certainly assured. But because even our Prayers are a testimony of our dependance upon God, and required as such by that God to whom they are made, and because we are naturally prompted thereto by our own wants and necessities, as which do of their own accord lead us to this way of seeking the relief of them; therefore it cannot but be thought reasonable thus to sue to God for their redress, but yet so, that we do not extend our desires, so far at least as temporal boons are the object of them, beyond the present time, and the pressing and urgent necessities thereof; because our silence as to future times and necessities is a greater argument of our dependance upon God, than any the most earnest Petitions. Thus may we at the same time express our dependance upon God, both by praying unto him and not praying, even by praying for what we presently need, and not praying at all for what we hereafter may; and there is this farther to incite us to this prescribed course, that, by confining our Petitions to the Bread of the present day, we oblige our selves to take up our Petitions, as often as a new day presents it self, and so continue, as well as begin that testimony of our dependance on him. If we are not alike bounded as to our desires of

spiritual blessings, it is not because it is not alike necessary for us to depend upon him for them; but because our desires thereof can never be too intense, and because, where we truly desire them we are not under the like fears and doubts concerning our obtaining of them. By which means there is not the like fear of distrustful the goodness of God in that particular, and therefore neither the like necessity of bounding our desires of spiritual blessings by the exigency of the present time. But as our desires of temporal blessings may be, and are too intense, and therefore have the more need to be bounded; to our fears of the want of them being proportionably intense, and thereby likely to make us the more distrustful of Gods readiness to confer them on us, there was still the more reason for God, to confine our desires to the blessings of the present time; Lest, if he should have permitted us to extend them farther, those desires might have begotten in us a farther sollicitousness for temporal blessings, and doubts concerning them, and thereby have taken us off proportionably from our dependance upon him for them. This however is certain both from the words of the present *Petition*, and Christ's elsewhere forbidding us to take thought for the morrow, that we ought to confine our desires of temporal blessings to the exigencies of the present time. If there remain any the least scruple concerning it, it must be upon the account of that provision which we commonly make for the future, but of which I shall give a satisfactory account when I have shewn what that is we are here taught to beg of God concerning our daily Bread.

III. Now the thing we are here taught to beg of God, is his giving that daily Bread to us, and which I conceive in the general to denote his *possessing us thereof*, and *making it salutary and helpful to us*. Of the former of these notions there can be no doubt at all, because it is so apparently the sense of that word which is here made use of; but what that notion doth either suppose, or include, will not be so easy to discern, and will therefore require some pains in the investigation of it. In the general I observe first, that as we cannot be possess'd of Bread, and other such like means of subsistence, unless God, who is to possess us of it, take care for the producing of it; so we are consequently thereto to beg of him all those blessings and benefits which are preparatory to it, yea to look upon the begging of them as included in the present one. But from hence it will follow first, that we are, even by the force of this, to pray for *seasonable weather*, for the *dew of Heaven*, and the *kindly influences of the Heavenly Bodies*: Because unless these smile upon us, that staff of ours will be broken, before it is in a capacity to sustain us, and we shall not only be without our daily Bread, but without the hopes of it. We have an handsome intimation of this, in that promise which God made to *Jezrael* q, and which will at the same time demonstrate the dependance of these Earthly benefits upon the influences of Heaven, and of both upon that God to whom we live. And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord, that I will hear the Heavens, and they shall hear the Earth, and the Earth shall hear the Corn, and the Wine, and the Oyl, and they shall hear Jezrael. For if the Earth cannot hear the Corn, or us, before that hear from the Heavens, nor the Heavens the Earth, before they themselves hear from God; we are of necessity to beg of him the influences of those Heavens, as without which we cannot obtain that Corn, whereof our Bread is to be made.

But

q Hosea 2.21,
22.

But from thence it equally follow, that we are to beg of the same God his *conserving* and *prospering* that *productive* power, which he hath implanted in that *Earth*, from whence it is to grow. For if the *Earth* must hear the *Corn*, before that can hear *us*, if, that it may so hear the *Corn*, it must hear from *God*, as well as from his *Heavenly influences* (as his *promising* that the *Earth shall hear the Corn*, doth sufficiently declare) then must we suppose a like necessity of *God's* watching over the *powers of the Earth*, in order to the producing of it, and of our imploring the watchfulness of his gracious providence over them. It will follow thirdly (because they are alike necessary to the producing of Bread) that we are even by the force of this Petition, and the general nature of the divine providence, to beg of the same God the *health* and *strength* of those, who are *exercised* in the cultivation of it. For though there was a time when the *Earth* could have *given it of it self*, or at least without any other assistance, than it had from God, and the *Heavenly Bodies*; yet, since the *fall* of man, and the *curse* of God upon it, the *Earth* has lost that happy property, neither can, or will it now hear us, though we call never so loud, unless the *Plowshare* speak, as well as we. But this supposeth *health*, and *strength*, as well as *diligence* in those that manage it, in our *Cattel*, and those that are to *direct* them; and we therefore, as the *Psalmist* speaks, to pray that *they also may be strong to labour*, as well as that the *Earth* may not be without *strength* to answer it. It will follow fourthly, because nothing is more destructive to Bread than War, inasmuch as it both diverteth the *Plowshare* from its proper Office, and makes havock of that *Corn* which hath been before produced by it, that the contrary thereof, even *Peace*, is as necessarily to be prayed for, in order to our obtaining of it. Otherwise that *Plowshare* may be converted into a *Sword* or *Spear*, and that *Sword* or *Spear* destroy, what in its former, and more peaceable capacity, it had help'd to give birth unto. It will follow lastly, because they are alike necessary to the producing of Bread, though not of that *Corn* whereof it is compos'd, that we do in like manner beg of God *fitable weather to inne it*, the preserving of it in those *Barns* or *Granaries* wherein it is bestow'd, opportunity and means to *bring it thence* to our own habitations, and so *prepare* it for our nourishment and refreshment. But beside our begging of God all those blessings and benefits which are preparatory to the producing of that Bread for which we pray, we are secondly to beg of him (as which indeed is more particularly intended) the putting us into possession of it; Though after what manner, or for what purposes we are to desire it, is not so clear from this Petition, but it may require an elucidation from us. For God may give us our daily Bread, as he did *Manna* to the *Israelites*; that is to say, without any cooperation of ours, or the assistance of other men; he may give it us again by the *ministry of other men*, and by stirring up the hearts of those into whose hands he hath put the possession of it, or he may give it to us, lastly, by the means of our own only *labours* or *estates*, and by prospering us in the exercise or management thereof. And surely thus far the *manner of giving* it ought to be left in that *generality* wherein it is here delivered, that we ought to permit it to his arbitrement, of whom we beg our daily Bread, to determine of the manner of it. Even we our selves having learnt to say in far less Cases, that *Beggars ought to be no chusers*, and, I suppose, with equal regard

regard to the manner of bestowing it, as to the nature or quality of the thing desir'd. But as it doth not from thence follow, but that we may descend even to the *specifying* thereof, provided that be done with submission to the divine will and pleasure; so I see not but we may, and ought to give the preference to such desires, as lead us to beg *our daily Bread* rather by *ordinary* than *extraordinary* means, as again, in *ordinary* ones, rather by our own *estates*, and *labours*, than by the *charity* of others, and by our *estates*, rather than by our *labours*, if God hath bestowed such *estates* upon us. For thus, because it is not to be believ'd that God will make use of *extraordinary* means, where the *ordinary* dispensations of his providence may suffice; we are in reason to beg our Bread rather by *ordinary*, than *extraordinary* ones, yea not to proceed to sue for the *latter*, till we are without all hopes of obtaining it by the *former*, of what nature soever they shall be found to be. The like preference ought to be given to such desires of ours, as lead us to beg our *Bread*, rather by our own *estates* or *labours*, than by the *charity* of others, as again, rather by prospering our *estates* (if God have given us any such, and those estates be sufficient to provide it) than by giving success to our *labours* and *endeavours*. For inasmuch as it is neither agreeable to the condition of men of better quality to live upon the charity of others, nor of any comfortable consideration to the nature of any; inasmuch as God hath appointed labour, or at least where he hath not superseded it by an estate, as the standing and ordinary means of procuring to our selves a subsistence; it cannot but be deemed reasonable to pray, that that Bread may rather accrue to us by that labour, or by our estates, than by stirring up the hearts of others to furnish us with it. For by the same reason that we are allowed to pray for such food as may be convenient, either for our nature or condition, by the same, or, at least, equal reason, we may think our selves privileged to pray, that it may accrue to us by such means, as are equally agreeable to them: How much more, when we desire no other of God, than its accruing to us by such means, as his providence hath furnished us with, and so made it yet more lawful to desire the continuance of (such as is that of an estate) or his Commands have represented to us as the ordinary means of procuring our subsistence; (such as is that of labour and travail). In like manner, because men of better birth or education cannot be suitably provided for, unless furnished with such a portion of external things, as may be answerable to their quality or breeding, being moreover so far favoured by God as to be furnished with estates suitable for it, and by which, (because sufficient for that end) they may reasonably presume, that it is the intention of the divine Majesty, that they should maintain themselves; I no way doubt, but, as they are permitted to beg of God food convenient for them, so they may beg it of him also, rather by the means of those *estates*, which he hath furnished them with, than by the means of their *labour* and *travail*; Those estates, which he hath furnished them withal, being no obscure indication of his intention to support them that way, and therefore neither an improbable proof of his allowing them to pray that God would be pleas'd to support them by continuing and prospering those estates unto them. Only let the possessors of such estates know, that as even they are not wholly exempted from the common burden of labour and travail, so it will become them to submit this
and

and other the like desires to the good pleasure of him, of whom they are here taught to beg that Bread which may be convenient for them. I will conclude what I have to say concerning that *possession* of Bread, which I have said to be the principal thing we are here taught to beg of God, after I have a little inform'd you *for what purposes* we ought to beg it, as well as after what *manner* we ought to desire to be put into it. Not that this latter *query* is of equal difficulty with the former, but because the resolution thereof will open a way toward the reconciling of this Petition with that Provision which we think ourselves oblig'd to make for after-times, as well as for the present day. For it is to be observed first from our Saviour's enjoining us to beg such Bread as may be *convenient* for us, that we are rather to desire it of God for our *use* and *comfort*, than for the *bare possession* of it, as again, from his confining our desires to the present day, that we are rather to desire it of God for our *present use* and *comfort*, than for that of *after-times*. But as considering the necessity of our own concurrence to it, it will be morally impossible for us to enjoy the Bread of the present day, if we have not before made Provision for it, and therefore that Provision no way forbidden by the present Petition; so that Provision will not be found to contradict the intent of this Petition, if it be seriously and carefully considered. For first it doth not appear to me that we are altogether forbidden by this Petition to desire any other than the Bread of the present day; but only that we should not simply and absolutely desire any other than it, because that alone is simply and absolutely necessary for us. And if this be the meaning of our Saviour's injunction here, there will be nothing in it to contradict that Provision of necessities, which we think our selves oblig'd to make for after-times. For though he who makes Provision for after-times, and, agreeably thereto, begs God's blessing on it, must consequently be thought to desire what he so labours after, and prays for; yet is there no necessity at all, that he should simply and absolutely desire it, and so after the same rate wherein he desires the Bread of the present day. For the Bread of future times being not simply and absolutely necessary, neither need it to be simply and absolutely desir'd; It is enough if it be desir'd so far forth, as God shall think it convenient, and as it shall be found to conduce to the possessing us of that sufficient Bread which he prompts us to pray every day for; In the mean time, because of the no absolute necessity thereof, and the assurance we have of Gods watching over our preservation, permitting the granting or denying of it to the sole pleasure of him, of whom we pretend to desire it. I say secondly, that though this Petition confine our desires to the Bread of the present day, or rather to that which may answer the necessities thereof; yet ought we to look upon our desires as so confin'd, rather as to the actual possession of it, than as to our being in a capacity to acquire it. We are licensed by this Petition to pray for the possession of so much Bread, as may answer the necessities of that day wherein we pray for it; we are tacitly forbidden by the same Petition to pray for the possession of any more; because not licensed to it by that, which was intended as a direction of our desires in this affair: But as it doth not from thence follow, but that we may desire to be in a capacity of acquiring more because that is of a different nature from the desire of the possession of it; so much less, if that capacity be ordinarily necessary to possess

possess us, even of that, for which we are allowed to pray. Which that it is, is evident from hence, because otherwise we may want our daily Bread, even when we have occasion to make use of it. Though therefore we may be limited in our desires to the Bread of the present day, or at least as to the actual possession of it, yet not so as to our being in a capacity to acquire it, and therefore neither as to our making Provision for it. I say thirdly, that though our Saviour do here confine our desires to the Bread of the present day, yet is not that so much to forbid our desires or Provisions for future times, but to forbid such desires or Provisions as may diminish in the least from our dependance upon the divine care and providence. For beside that we, who are here confin'd in our desires to the Bread of the present day, as well for others as for our selves, are elsewhere expressly enjoind to lay up, and provide for the future, yea so, that, if we do not, we shall make our selves worse than *infidels*; our Saviour himself resumes the Argument that is now before us, even that of *care*, only for *care*, and upon the account of *care*, watchfulness of *care*, and the necessity thereof, crieth thereupon, *care*, which means, *care* of desires or provisions for the future, to be forbidden by this Petition, as shall appear manifestly sufficient with the other. From whence as it will follow, that *care* of all desire or Provision for the future which is here forbidden, shall be before this Petition not to be alledg'd in bar of it; so all that will be further requisite for us to give an account of, is what those desires or Provisions are, which are inconsistent with our trust in God. Now those are either such, as carry us to the use of unlawful means, or not so, yet with such an eagerness, as to occasion perturbations in us, if we happen to be disappointed of the object of them. For if we betake our selves to the former, we shew a manifest distrust of the divine providence, because we cannot think it to be his will, to help us by such means as he himself hath forbidden. Not to say, that when we do so, we rather extort our Bread, than beg of him to give it us, and so do yet more directly offend against that Petition, which prompts us to expect it from him. And if our desires on the other hand be so eager, as to raise perturbations in us, if we happen to fail of the object of them, they are equally distrustful ones; because the belief of his care and providence will so ascertain our future subsistence to us, as to leave no place for any anxious thoughts about it. And against such desires and provisions as these, I willingly grant that this Petition of our Lord was intended, so that can any man, who pretends to make use of it, allow himself such desires or provisions, without contradicting both the Petition and the promise. But for other desires and provisions for the future, I see no reason why they should be inconsistent with it; especially if they be also interior, and ought to be, to those desires which have the more necessary Bread of the present day for their object, and moreover aim rather at our being in a capacity to acquire it, when that day shall arrive, than at the actual possession of it before it doth. For such desires as those will keep us in a perpetual dependance upon God, they will either wholly confine us to the more necessary Bread of the present day, or at least to confine all our thoughts and provisions, and cares to it, as not to be under any trouble of mind, if that be secured to us. And if that be our case, as it ought to be, and was no doubt, the main design

design of this Petition to suggest, we shall neither offend against *that*, by extending our desires and endeavours beyond the present, because *simply* and *absolutely* aiming at no more, nor offend against a due *provision* for the future, by confining our desires to the present, because obliged only to such a confinement of them, as may keep us in a perpetual *dependance* upon God, with which a due provision for the future is not at all inconsistent.

But beside the *possessing us of our daily Bread*, and all those other things which it doth either suppose or imply, it will be equally necessary, even by the force of this Petition, to beg of him, of whom we ask it, to *make it salutary and helpful* to us. For though that be not equally implied in the word *Give*, if it be simply and absolutely considered, yet is it alike evident from the *end* for which *Bread* was ordain'd, and Christs obliging us to pray, that God would give us such Bread, as may be *necessary*, or *convenient* for us. For if Bread were intended for our nourishment and comfort; if we are directed by our Saviour to beg it for that end, as is evident from his prompting us to beg such Bread as may be convenient for us; then must it be thought alike our duty, and alike the design of this Petition, to ask of God as well the making it *salutary and helpful* to us, as to put us into the *possession* of it. The result whereof will be, our asking of him, as the Scripture *x* speaks, *power to eat thereof*, as without which we cannot be in a disposition to be advantag'd by it, and such farther *health and strength* of Body, as may enable us to digest it, and to convert it into our own substance.

x Eccl. 5. 15

IV. I have shewn *what that is* we are here taught to ask, for *what time* we are to ask it, and *what to ask of God towards it*, it remains that we enquire into the *grounds* of our so asking it of him, and which are in the general, our own certain *need* of it, and *dependance* upon God for it. Concerning our *need of Bread*, and other such like means of subsistence, I shall not need to say any thing, because that need of ours is too apparent to be deni'd, and too much felt by our selves, not to be acknowledged by us. And I shall only add, that Christ, to whom the necessities of our nature were not unknown, was willing, by this Petition of his, to call them frequently to our minds, and to humble us under the apprehension of them; That so, being sensible of those necessities, we might be yet more prepar'd to acknowledge our *dependance upon God* for the supply of them, and accordingly sue to him for it. A dependance, which, it may be, we have much more reason to consider, and present God with a due acknowledgment of, than any other dependance whatsoever. For whatever may be thought of spiritual Gifts, and which, for the little agreeableness thereof to our natural inclinations, we may perhaps be willing enough to acknowledge unto him, from whom the Scripture tells us, *that every good and perfect gift com-*

y James 1. 17

eth; Yet Bread, and other such like means of our support seem owing only to our own labour, and providence, or the liberality of those from whom it immediately descendeth to us. They who have it, at first, seem to attain it by their plowing and sowing, and other the like means they make use of to cause the Earth to produce it; or, if not without the influences of Heaven, as they see they cannot, yet such, as do for the most part regularly and certainly descend upon it, but however cannot do otherwise than they do. They, who receive this Bread from

the first owners, purchase it by their labours, or by that money, which their own, or other mens labours have procured for them. And though Bread so purchased be not Bread, even to the owners thereof, or at least hath not the *usefulness* of Bread, till it come to be applied by them to themselves and regularly digested by their Stomachs; yet as it is in their power so to apply it if they please, and so far forth their own only care and providence concerned in it, so that digestion of theirs, as they suppose, depends only on their own temper, or constitution, and which, if they find not good, they may either make good, or correct by sutable Medicines, or, if not so, must suffer by the evilness thereof. By which means the recourse they have for Bread, or the due digestion of it, must be to their own either labour, or providence, or, if not only to themselves, yet to the assistance of such causes, as are alike natural, but not to the providence of any supernatural one. These are generally the thoughts of the greater part of Mankind, as is evident from their either *fearing* or *hoping*, meerly as *natural* causes shall give occasion, and the *little care* they take to *approve* themselves to him, from whom even temporal boons are supposed to come. But with how little reason will appear, if we reflect upon those proofs I have elsewhere given of a Providence, even from the light of nature, or the clear Declarations of the Scripture. For what is there, even in this particular, which we can so call our own, that we are not much more indebted to God for it? Is the Bread we eat our own? so it may be after God hath given it us, but it cannot become our own, till he be pleased to possess us of it. For it is I (said God by the Prophet *Hosea*) that gave *Israel* Corn, and Wine, and Oyl, and it was my Corn, and my Wine, and Oyl, and Flax which they enjoy'd. If their own labour and

^z Explicat. of the Apostles Creed. In the words, *I believe in God.*

^a *Hosea* 2. 8, 9.

^b *Deut.* 8. 18.

^c *Pro.* 10. 22.

providence concurr'd to the procuring of it, yet it was I who fitted them for labour, and so, as he elsewhere ^b speaks, gave them power to get it, and it was I too who gave success to those their labours and endeavours: It being the blessing of the Lord, as the Wife man ^c speaks, which contributes more to men's enriching, than all their own labours and endeavours; and he, and he alone, who addeth no sorrow with it. As indeed, why otherwise should not all, that are alike industrious, and provident, attain alike to them? Nay why should there be so great a difference between men (which yet hath been frequently observ'd) that some with all their travail can hardly compass a subsistence, when at the same time men of less diligence and providence rise to great Estates, and as freely and undisturbedly enjoy them? For to found this difference upon chance, otherwise than that they be used to denote the unaccountable variety of the dispensations of the divine providence, seems to me rather to say, that we are not acquainted with the cause of it, than to satisfy our selves, or others, that the divine providence doth not make the difference: Because the accidents, by which it is occasion'd, are often-times so many, and so unusual, that they cannot be thought to happen unto men, without the guidance of a more intelligent and watchful being, than chance, in the usual sense of it, can be supposed to be. Hitherto therefore nothing appears, why we should not beg our Bread of God, yea do so, upon a presumption of our owing it to his favour and blessing. But if we dare trust the Scripture, we may think our selves yet more indebted to him for it, because indebted to him also for those influences of Heaven, by which it is at first produced,

ced, and indebted to him too for that *benefit* we receive from it, even when we have it. For it is *he*, as the Scripture *d* speaks, who *giveth the d* former and the latter rain, who *causeth the Sun to shine e*, and his rain to fall upon that Earth which doth produce it. It is he, as the same Scripture *f* speaks, that *bears the Heavens* before they *hear the Earth*, or either the *one*, or the *other* of them *hear*, or *answer* our requests. And of this even the *Heathen* were so persuaded, that they made nothing more proper unto God, than the giving of fruitful seasons; and we find St. Paul accordingly *g* pressing them with that testimony of the divine providence. And they had this reason, among others, for it, that as the seasons of rain were not so fixed, but that they were sometimes strangely and for a long time suspended, which shew'd them, that there might be some superiour power to controul and over-rule them; so they generally hapned so regularly, and so suitably to the need the Earth had of them, that they could not, without some violence to their own understandings, hinder themselves from believing, that there was an intelligent and watchful power, who had so wisely and providently disposed them. Whether they alike acknowledged unto God their own receiving benefit by that *Bread*, which was so produced, and bestowed upon them, I will not now inquire, because it is not much material. But sure I am the Scripture hath taken care to inform us of it; because giving us to understand, that it is he who *giveth us power i* to eat of it, as well as to get it, and if there be any force in that threat of his, that men should *eat k* and not be satisfied, that it is also, by his blessing upon it, that we come to be sustained by it. The former whereof hath this farther to justify it, that there are not a few in the World, who cannot find in their hearts to taste of that plenty they are possess'd of, as the latter, that what is perform'd within us, toward the due digestion of that Bread we eat, is so far from being under the conduct or our care, that we find it next to impossible, to be able only to understand the manner of it. For this certainly makes it reasonable to believe, that as it is not without the blessing of him, to whom we pray, that we attain our Bread, so neither without his providence that it becomes usual to us.

Jer. 5. 24.

Joel 2. 23.

e Mat. 5. 45.

f Hosea 2. 21,

22:

g Vid. qua Pri-

cans annot. ad

Mat. 5. 45.

Act. 14. 17. 69

alibi.

b Act. 14. 17:

i Eccl. 5. 19.

k Mic. 6. 14.

T 2

And

And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.

THE CONTENTS.

Of the Order of this Petition, and why, considering the momentousness of it, it is subjoin'd to that of our daily Bread. An address to the Explanation of the Petition it self, where an account is first given of what things are suppos'd by it, and then of that which is expressed. The things suppos'd, the being of trespasses in us, their making us debtors to the divine vengeance, the impossibility of our being freed from it without the divine mercy, and the necessity that lies upon us of confessing all these things to God, and particularly those trespasses which we stand guilty of. A more minute account of the Confession of our trespasses, and enquiry thereupon made, whether it ought to extend to particulars, and how far that ought to prevail in the publick Confessions of the Church. That forgiveness, which is expressed in the Petition, brought next under Consideration; where again is shewn, wherein it doth consist, and what we beg of God together with it. Of that forgiveness which is suppos'd as due from us unto our Brethren, concerning which enquiry is made what the nature thereof is, under what notion it is here propos'd, and the reasonableness of that proposal. Among other things is shewn, that it is here proposed by our Saviour, as the condition upon which we ought both to beg, and expect that forgiveness for which we pray.

AS much as the Soul ought to be preferr'd before the Body, and the Eternal welfare of both before the temporal welfare of the latter, so much ought that forgiveness, for which we are here taught to pray, to be preferr'd before that daily Bread the desire whereof was but now suggested to us. For by that forgiveness we are delivered from God's wrath, and from eternal death; our minds enjoy a present peace, and tranquillity, and are not without the hopes of a far greater peace, and joy; Whereas the utmost our daily Bread affords us, is the present support and comfort of our bodies, but which cannot but be much impair'd by the fears of an after reckoning, and that eternal death which attends all those whose sins are not before done away. For what good will that Bread do us, nay what present comfort can it possibly afford us, if our sins remain unpardoned, if we are in a manner only fatted by it for destruction? which makes it the more strange, that this great boon of forgiveness should not have the precdency of the other, and as it ought no doubt to have the first and principal place in our desires, so have the first and principal place also in our Petitions. But as it is not easy to conceive therefore, but that our

Saviour

a Tertull. de Oratione. c. 7. Quid enim alimenta proderunt, si illi reputamur reuera, quasi sanus ad ultimam?

Saviour had a peculiar reason for premising the Petition of *daily Bread* to that of the *forgiveness of our trespasses*; So there is this apparant reason of that procedure of his, that that *temporal life*, to which *daily Bread* ministers, is pre-requir'd to the acquiring of our *forgiveness*, it must put us into a condition of praying for it, and using all other requisite means for the obtaining of it. Which will make it alike necessary to premise the *begging* of it, and of that *Bread* by which it is to be maintain'd. We cannot hope to obtain *forgiveness* without praying for it or endeavouring after it; we can as little hope to be in a condition for that, unless our *life* be continued to us, or *live*, unless we be furnished with *Bread*. And as therefore he, who first of all desires that, and the support of the present life, doth but comply therein with the order of nature, and the invincible Law of necessity; So if he beg the *present life*, and the *Bread* of it, to fit him for the attaining of *greater*, and *more important boons*, he will at the same time consult both his temporal and eternal welfare, yea shew himself to have a greater regard unto the latter, than if he had premis'd the desire of it, because asking the former but in order to it.

But not any longer to insist on the due place of this Petition, because there is enough in the Petition it self to call for our regard; let us now reflect upon that which it teacheth us to ask of God, and upon the terms on which it prompteth us to desire it.

I. That which it teacheth us to ask of God, is the *forgiveness of our trespasses*, or, as *St Matthew* b expresseth it, of our *debts*; but which b Mat. 6. 12. cannot well be understood, without a pre-notion of those *trespasses*, or *debts*, because proceeding upon the supposition of them. To make way therefore for the clearer understanding of it, I will premise so much concerning those *trespasses*, or *debts*, as the Petition we are now upon will oblige us to consider.

Now there are four things observable concerning those *trespasses*, or *debts*, the *forgiveness* whereof we are here taught to ask of God. 1. The being of those *trespasses* in us. 2. Their making us *obnoxious* to the divine vengeance. 3. The impossibility of our being discharged from it without God's grace and mercy. As fourthly, and lastly, The necessity that lies upon us of making an ingenious confession or acknowledgment of them all.

1. I meddle not at present with the general nature of our *trespasses* or *debts*, because I have said enough elsewhere c toward the clearing of it; that which I shall first of all take notice of, is the being of those *trespasses* in us, and which the Petition I am now upon doth manifestly suppose: He who asketh pardon, as *Tertullian* d speaks, confessing a fault which stands in need of it, how much more, when he expressly asks the forgiveness of those *trespasses*, the pardon whereof he professeth to desire? Thus it is easy to reason from the Petition that is now before us, and so we shall find those to have done, who either preceded or followed that *Pelagius*, who asserted among other novelties, the possibility of an unsinning obedience. The testimony of *Tertullian* I have given you already, and shall therefore give the first place to that of *St Cyprian*. For how necessarily, saith he e, and providently, and salutarily, are we admonished of our being sinners, who are by this Petition compelled to ask for our sins, that whilst pardon is beg'd of God, the mind may remember its own conscience. For lest any should please himself with the conceit

Explic. of the Creed. Artic. Of remission of sins.

d De oratione cap. 7. Examine leges of Petitionis vana; quia qui petit veniam delictum confitetur.

e Cyprian. De Oratione. Dominica.

f Lib. 7.

g Lib. 1.

In Psa 142.
1 Hist. Pelag.
Lib. 3. Part. 1.
pag. 467.

editio. 2. 1142.
editio. 1. 1142.
editio. 1. 1142.
editio. 1. 1142.
editio. 1. 1142.
editio. 1. 1142.
editio. 1. 1142.
editio. 1. 1142.
editio. 1. 1142.
editio. 1. 1142.

k Voss. ubi su
1142. 1142. 1142.
1142. 1142. 1142.
1142. 1142. 1142.

conscience of his being innocent, when in truth no man is such, he is instructed and taught that he sinneth every day, by being commanded every day to pray for his sins, with other remarks to the same purpose. There can no man be found saith Optatus f, who is entirely holy. For if there are any, who can be without sin, they lie in the Lords Prayer, if, without any cause, they ask pardon, saying unto God the Father, forgive us our sins as we also forgive our debtors. (And again, when you turn to the Alter, you cannot omit the Lords Prayer, nor say it, but you must say Our Father, which, when in Heaven, forgive us our sins and our debts. Now what are you called, remember what do you call yourself, but a Sinner, whilst you thus confess your sins? And how well St Augustine agrees with the forementioned Authors, will appear if we reflect upon the answers that were made by the Pelagians to the force of that Petition we insist upon. For the understanding whereof we are to know, that as it was not easy for them to avoid altogether the acknowledgment of those trespasses, the forgiveness whereof we are taught to beg, so they chose rather by nice distinctions to evade the force thereof, than utterly to deny those trespasses which it supposeth. That which seems first of all to have been said is, that this Petition seems rather to have been fram'd for unbelievers than believers, or, if for believers also, rather for the generality thereof, than for the principal members, or heads of them. But how little reason there was for that allegation, the following passage of St Augustine b, as I find him cited by Kossius i, with the forementioned testimonies, may satisfy any reasonable man. Finally, my Brethren, that you may the sooner acknowledge the truth of what I say, that no flesh is justified in the sight of God, they themselves, even the Leaders of Christs Flock, have learned to pray what we also do; to them also was this rule of praying given by the Heavenly Lawyer. For after this manner, saith he, pray ye. And when he had premised certain other things he added this also, that our Rams and the Leaders of the Sheep should say it; they themselves have learned to say, forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors. They said not, We thank thee, that thou hast forgiven our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors; but forgive, as we also forgive. Thus it seems they prayed, being now both Believers, and Apostles. For that Prayer of our Lord was rather given to Believers. If only those debts had been meant, which are forgiven by Baptism, it would be more proper for Catechumens to pray, forgive us our debts. Let the Apostles therefore say, forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors. And when it shall be said to them, Why do ye say this? or what debts are there of yours? Let them answer, because no flesh shall be justified in the sight of God. This subterfuge therefore not prevailing, because this Petition, with the rest, had been given both to Believers and Apostles, it was necessary to subjoin another, and which seems to be much more specious; to wit, that, though the best of men, yea Apostles were obliged thus to pray, yet it was rather for other men, than themselves, and particularly for those, whose heads, and mouths they were. And that the Pelagians thus reason'd for themselves, is evident from the seventh Canon of that Carthaginian Council, which is commonly call'd the Milevitan k, as which doth both take notice of and censure it. But beside that there is no ground for any such distinction in the Prayer it self, but rather for the contrary (for if we beg before for our own daily Bread, as well as for the daily Bread of others, why not also for the forgiving of our own trespasses?) Beside that

that this Prayer and every Petition of it was given first of all for the direction of mens *private devotions*, and where, though the concerns of others are not to be neglected, yet to be sure our own are principally to be intended; As the forementioned Canon observes, *St James was a holy and just Apostle when he said l, for in many things we offend all.* *For why was the word, All, added? but that that sentence might agree with the Psalm m where we read, Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for no man living shall be justified in thy sight.* And in the Prayer of the most wise Solomon n, *there is not a man, who sinneth not.* And a little after in the same Canon, *Whence also the holy and just Daniel, when, speaking in the plural number, he had said in Prayer, we have sinned and done iniquity o, and other things which he there truly and humbly confesseth; Lest he should be thought, as some are of opinion, that he spake not these things of his own sins, but of the sins of the people rather, he afterwards added, When I was praying p and confessing mine own sins and the sins of my people to the Lord our God, He would not say our sins, but the sins of his people and his own, because he foresaw, as a Prophet, that there would be those, who would make so ill a construction of his words.* From all which as it appears that holy and just men were obliged by this Petition to pray for themselves as well as others, so nothing therefore remained to be said, but what we find, by the forementioned Council q, that the Pelagians did, that holy men were moved so to pray, rather *humbly than truly*, with a design to depress them in their own eyes, than as constrained, thereto by the force of their own transgressions. But beside that it is not humility, but lying, to beg of God with our lips, that he would forgive us our debts, and in the mean time to say in our hearts, *we have no debts to be forgiven*, as the forementioned Council r hath pertinently observ'd; *St John hath said enough to shew, as that Council observes farther s, that we ought to pray, with respect to the truth of the thing, that God would forgive us our debts or trespasses: There I mean, where he affirms, yea includes himself in the number; that if we say we have no sin t, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us.* He might indeed have said (and if he had done so, there would have been some pretence for this exception) *that if we say we have no sin, we exalt our selves, and there is no humility in us.* But when he saith, that, if we so speak, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us, he sufficiently shews, that he who saith, *he hath no sin*, speaks that which is not true, but false, and shall therefore be under an obligation to pray for forgiveness of his trespasses, by the force of truth, as well as of the Precept of humility. And indeed as the being of such trespasses is sufficiently evident to those men's Consciences, who have taken the pains to compare their own actions with those Laws which ought to be the rule of them, so it seems to me not a little confirm'd by the evil temper of those, who have taken upon them to maintain a possibility of freedom from all. For who of old did maintain such a freedom, but those, who denied the necessity of God's grace, and who by that denial of theirs fell into the gross sins of falsehood, and pride? Or who of late but those of the Jesuitical party, on the one hand, or of those who are not far removed from them, even the Quakers on the other? The former whereof have, by their gross Idolatries, converted their very religious actions into sins; as the latter shew'd themselves sufficient transgressors by their both disobeying and reviling of magistrates, that I say nothing at all of their perverting the

1 voss. ibid.

m Psa. 143. 2.

n 1 Kings 8. 6

o Dan. 9. 5.

p ----- 20.

q Can. 3.

r Ibid.

s Can. 6.

t 1 Joh. 1. 8.

u *Iren. adv. he-
ref. li. i. cap. 1.*

x *Vid. Les Pro-
vinciales, &
La Morale des
Jesuites.*

y *Disc. of mens
inability to
keep the Com-
mandments of
God without
his special
grace.*

z *Luke 11. 4.
a* *Explicat. of
the Creed, Ar-
ticle, Of the
forgiveness of
sins.*
b *Mat. 6. 12.*

the Scriptures, yea preferring their own fancies to them. For these are so far from bringing any credit to a sinless state, that they are on the contrary a sad instance of a corrupt and degenerate one. Of which we have this farther proof, that as the *Valentinians* of old *u* fancied that nothing could defile them, how abominable soever in it self, or blameworthy in other men, so these have taken a like course to justify themselves, as to those trespasses, from which they affirm men may be free; I mean not so much by shewing, that they have not been guilty of such trespasses (which were the only fair way of evincing it) but by taking away the very being of such trespasses (for so the *Jesuits* have done *x* in a great measure) or by taking it away as to themselves, as who are sufficiently protected against them by the spirituality of their nature: In the mean time giving themselves over to any thing which may make for their advantage, or which either shame, or fear of punishment shall not restrain them from. Such are the pernicious effects of asserting a sinless state, and indeed there is no other way to make it probable to themselves or others. But how much safer, as well as more agreeable to truth and this Petition is it, to acknowledge our trespasses and bewail them, and (what such an acknowledgment and sorrow will naturally produce) to strive as much as may be to diminish them? For though there be no hopes at all of a perfect freedom from trespasses, yet there is no doubt we ought to endeavour it, as much as we may; and there is as little doubt, but we may, and ought to be much more free from them than we are. But how far, as I have already *y* allotted another place to determine, so the consideration thereof will not be so proper here; because all we have now to shew is (what the premises do sufficiently evince) that we are not without those trespasses, the forgiveness whereof we are here taught to beg.

2. The second thing observable concerning those *trespasses*, the forgiveness whereof we are taught to beg, is their making us obnoxious to the divine vengeance. A thing, which though not so clear from *St Luke's* *z* Account of this Petition, and those words wherein it is commonly delivered, yet is (as I have elsewhere *a* shewn) sufficiently evident from the nature of those trespasses, and from that title of debts which *St Matthew*, in his account thereof *b*, doth bestow upon them. For every *trespass*, or sin, as *such*, being the *transgression* of a Law, and (because all other Laws receive their strength from his) of some Law of God, it doth *eo ipso* oblige the committer of it to suffer punishment, if he, against whose Law it is committed, will be pleased to inflict it. For it being in the power of him, who hath a right command, to punish the transgressions of those Commands, as without which all Authority would be vain; it must consequently be but the just obligation of him, who transgresseth them, to suffer punishment, if he, against whom he offended, will be pleased to inflict it. Again, if *trespasses*, or sins have both the name and nature of *debts*, as we see they have, as elsewhere, so in this very Petition, in the words wherein it is delivered by *St Matthew*; if (as I have shewn in the place before-quoted) they are therefore entitled *debts*, because, like debts properly so called, they oblige him, who did not satisfy his first obligation, to suffer condign punishment for it; then must they be supposed, as committed against God, to make us obnoxious to his vengeance, and to those punishments which that shall lead him to. Which yet is no more than what

what the general reason of mankind prompts them to argue; and their mode of speech, which is one of the most certain indications of their opinions, doth as clearly confirm. For it is not among the *Hebrews* only that *sins*, or *trespasses* have the name, or nature of *debts*, that they are look'd upon as obliging those to punishment, who happen to be guilty of them. For agreeably to that name and notion, we find men of all Languages to express themselves; those who were more near to the *Hebrews* Language and Country, and those who were farther removed from them. For thus what is in the *Hebrew* c in the way of *sins*, is by the *Chaldee* Paraphrase rendred in the way of *debtors*, as elsewhere thou hast brought upon me and my Kingdom d a great *sin*, by thou hast brought upon me a great *debt*. And thus too both the *Greeks* and *Latins* (lest we should think that mode of speech to have pass'd from the *Hebrews* to other Nations) are wont to speak, with relation to those *sins*, or *trespasses*, whereof we now discourse. For to owe judgment e, or to owe punishment f, is affirmed by them of evil persons, and who by their evil actions make themselves lyable to it; and to give g or pay punishment, among the *Latins*, it set for suffering it. Which shews what, in the opinion of all Nations, is the proper consequent of *sins*, or *trespasses*, and that they bind the committers of them to suffer punishment. I will conclude what I have to say concerning this obligation, after I have, for the farther clearing of it, added this one necessary remark, that as those *trespasses*, whereof we speak, make the committers of them obnoxious to the divine vengeance, so they do it not only as to temporal pains and death h, but also to eternal ones. Of which, beside other proofs, we have this remarkable saying of our Saviour for a witness, where he tells us i that of every idle word, which men shall speak, they shall give an account at the day of judgment; for by thy words thou shalt be justified and by thy words too thou shalt be condemned. For being even idle words (which, if any, might be look'd upon as venial) shall be brought before and condemned by that future judgment; being the punishment that judgment shall award, is not temporal but eternal fire, as we are elsewhere k assured by our Saviour; what ground can there be to believe, that there is any trespass so venial, as to be expiated by a temporary punishment? Indeed, as in others, so in these debts also there is a diversity, as there shall be in the degrees of those punishments that are allotted to them; a debt of ten thousand l talents, such as that of the Lord's servant in the parable, and a debt of an hundred pence, such as that which he exacted m of his fellow servant. But be they of what degree they will, they must be acknowledged to be debts, as well as trespasses, before we obtain the forgiveness of them; they must be acknowledged to be debts, even to eternal vengeance.

3. I think I shall not need to say much concerning the impossibility of our being discharged from the former obligation, without the grace and mercy of that God, against whom those trespasses are committed. For the obligation being to God the discharge must be also from him, and therefore not to be expected, without his merciful release of it. If there be any thing, beside that grace and mercy of his, to discharge us of it, it must be the tender of a proportionable satisfaction, and such as shall be found to answer the debt that is owing by us. But beside that, as I have elsewhere n shewn, there is no necessity of admitting such a satisfaction, and therefore the mercy of God pre-requir'd to our discharge (for satisfaction

c Psa. 1. 1.

d Gen. 20. 9.

f Debere pangs.
g Dare, & pen-
dere pangs.

h Rom. 5. 12.

i Mat. 12. 36,
37.

k — 25. 41,
46.

l Mat. 18. 24.

m — 28.

n Explication
of the Creed.
In the word
D ad.

being the paying that which was not under obligation, it must be in the power of him, to whom it is tender'd, either to admit of it, or not.) Neither have we (*of our selves* I mean) any such *satisfaction* to offer, and therefore neither any means of discharging our selves from the other. For shall we, as the Prophet *Micah* speaks, present him with innumerable *Sacrifices*, or with *ten thousand of rivers of oil*? But even these, as they are no way able to discharge the debt, so they are none of ours to dispose of; every beast of the Forest being his p already, and the Cattel upon a thousand Hills. Shall we therefore, in default of any thing of that nature, go on, as the same *Micah* speaks, to present him with our *first-born*, the fruit of our Body for the sin of our Soul? These indeed may with more reason be called ours, because concurring more immediately to the production of them. But inasmuch as even these are an *heritage of the Lord*, and the fruit of the Womb is his reward, by the giving of these we can no way contribute to the clearing of our debt, because we shall still give him of that, which is his own. Shall we therefore thirdly present him with the fruits of a pious and exemplary life for the future, yea with that which God himself requires in the forequoted Prophecy, and styles by the name of *good*, even with *doing justly and loving mercy, and walking humbly with our God*? This cannot be deny'd to be the most acceptable payment, and to go farthest toward the discharge of that debt we have contracted. But whosoever shall consider what our Saviour hath said; that *when we have done all those things that are commanded us, we are unprofitable servants*; we have done but that which was our duty to do, will be easily induced to believe that these can no way avail to the discharge of our debt, because even these also were before due unto him. And if men may not hope thus to discharge their own debts, how much less those of others, or we expect to be released by them. Shall we lastly hope to discharge our debt by works of *supererogation*, that is to say, by such works, or rather instances of piety, as do not appear to be under Command, but may not unreasonably be presumed to be acceptable to the Almighty. But as even those, (if there be any such) become free to omit or perform, rather by the *indulgence* of that Almighty one, than that he hath not sufficient Authority to enjoin them on us: so it must therefore be look'd upon as not of sufficient force to put this to discharge from the other: That which is but a matter of *indulgence*, being rather to be reckon'd to the account of him, by whom it is granted, than to the credit on whom it is bestowed. Thus which way soever we turn our eyes we can find nothing that can avail these debts, but the mercy and goodness of him, to whom we are obliged by them, and then no wonder that our Saviour doth remit us to the mercy of God, and prompts us to beg of him the forgiveness of our sins.

4. One only thing remains of what I have said to be supposed concerning those trespasses, the forgiveness whereof we beg, even the necessity that lies upon us of *confessing* to God the several particulars before-mentioned, that there are such trespasses, that those trespasses make us *obnoxious* to the divine Vengeance, and that we cannot be released from it without the divine mercy and goodness. And surely there is enough in the Petition itself to oblige us to the acknowledgment of each of these, there is enough in the very surface of it to prompt us to the doing of it. For if we are oblig'd to *praise forgiveness of our trespasses*,

passes, as we are, if this Petition and Prayer were intended as a pattern, or form; we must consequently be obliged to a confession of those trespasses, because, as we learn'd from *Tertullian*, the very asking of pardon is the confession of a fault, and how much more then the asking pardon thereof in express terms? Again, if we are obliged to ask forgiveness of them in the quality of debts (for so *St Matthew's* expressing it by the name of debts shews) there will be a like necessity too of acknowledging to the same God, that we have made our selves obnoxious to his vengeance by them; for to own them as debts is no obscure acknowledgment of it. In fine, if, as the same Petition persuades, or at least our being obliged to put it up to our Father which is in Heaven, if I say we ought to beg of him the forgiveness of our trespasses, we must consequently be under a necessity of acknowledging to the same God the impossibility of our deliverance from them without his grace and mercy; because the begging of that deliverance from him is as clear an acknowledgment of the other. These things, I say, are evident in the general from the Petition that is now before us, they are so from the very surface, or out-side of it. But as they are of too great importance to be suffer'd to rest upon it, especially if they may receive a farther confirmation, so what the particular grounds of each of those confessions are, and what the respective Laws thereof are, will require a more accurate consideration, and which therefore I will now set my self to give them.

To begin with the *Confession of our trespasses*, because the foundation of the other, and because most apparent from the Petition that is now before us; Where the first thing I shall take notice of is the grounds of our obligation to it, and which are either *natural* or *positive*. The *natural* grounds of our obligation to it are the same with those of other religious duties, and particularly of that of Prayer, to which it is annexed. For being under a necessity of acknowledging our dependance upon God, as to those several benefits for which we pray; being therefore under a like necessity of acknowledging our dependance upon him, as to that of the forgiveness of sins, and so much the rather, because of the super-excellency thereof; We must consequently be under a necessity of acknowledging to him those sins or trespasses, for the forgiveness whereof we pretend to depend upon him: It being those sins, or trespasses, which make us to stand in need of, or depend upon him for forgiveness, and which therefore must be own'd by us to declare our acknowledgment of the other. Again, being under a necessity of acknowledging our dependance by our Bodies as well as by our Souls, and particularly by the expressions of our mouths, being consequently thereto, oblig'd to to acknowledg our dependance upon him, for that forgiveness of sins we are here taught to beg, we must also, because that is pre-requir'd to the acknowledgment of it, acknowledge with our mouths those sins we beg the pardon of, which is the proper notion of Confession. Such evidence there is even from natural grounds, of the obligation of that Confession of sin, which the present Petition supposeth. And if there be not the like evidence from *positive* ones, even the Commands of God in Scripture, we ought not at all to wonder at it; because where the voice of nature is clear and plain, there is the less necessity for the Scripture to interpose. Though that we are not without sufficient proofs, even from thence, will appear, if we consider what the Scripture hath observed to us concerning it. For we have first, in some particular

Discourse 1
in the introd.

ibid.

Rom. 10. 16

particular Cases, an express Injunction, to the Jews, to *confess their sins*,
^a Lev. 5. 5. *a* over and above the bringing a trespass offering for them : Which,
^{Num. 5. 6, 7.} though it will not immediately reach us, because none of their descen-
dants, yet will do, by virtue of Christ's confirming their Law, so far
forth as it shall appear to be built upon natural equity. We have far-
ther (which is yet more home) an Injunction to Aaron to confess over
^b Lev. 16. 21. the Scape Goat *b* all the iniquities of the Children of Israel, and all their
transgressions in all their sins, in order to the delivery of them from
them. For though the Confession there enjoined was in a matter of Ce-
remonial observance, yet as the Confession it self had nothing in it of
that nature, so it was in such a Ceremonial observance, as was a mani-
fest type of our Saviour, and to the obtaining of whose satisfaction
therefore we have equal reason to believe that the like Confession of
sins ought to be premis'd; yea that we are under an obligation to it by
this very Command of God. For even Ceremonial Laws, as I have
elsewhere ^c shewn, were written for our learning and direction, as to
^c Introd. to the that which was the principal intendment of them. We have in fine,
^{Explicat. of} even from the Old Testament, such Declarations concerning Confession
^{the Decal.} of sins, as shew it to be a thing to which forgiveness of sins is annexed
^{Disc. 3.} by God, and without which we are not to expect it. Which what are
they, but an intimation of its being under Command, yea so far forth
^d Lev. 26. 40, that nothing can be more? Thus Moses ^d plainly insinuates, where, after
^{&c.} he had, in the name of God, threatned the Israelites with many evils,
he brings in the same God promising that he would be gracious unto
them if they *confessed their iniquity and the iniquity of their Fathers, with*
their trespass, which they trespassed against him. For to what purpose that
intimation of Confession, especially after the mention of so many judg-
ments, were it not that he would have them look upon it as one of
those things which he required, in order to the release of them from
the other? To the same purpose is that known Prayer of Solomon ^e,
^e 2 Chro. 6. which he made at the Dedication of the Temple; for had not Confes-
^{37: 39.} sion of sin been pre-requir'd to pardon, why should he there mention
^{1 Kings 8. 47.} the Israelites acknowledging that they had *sinned and done amiss* among
^{&c.} the conditions, on which he begs of God to grant them the pardon of
them? But so the same Solomon doth yet more plainly declare ^f, because
^f Pro. 28. 13. giving us to understand as well, that *he who covereth his sins shall not*
prosper, as that he who confesseth, and forsaketh them shall have mercy. For
there we have forgiveness so annexed to Confession of sin, as to exclude
him that covers it from any expectation of it. Only if what hath been
alleged both from reason, and the Old Testament, be not thought of
sufficient force to inculcate it; it is to be hoped that the addition of
what St John hath affirm'd concerning it will suffice toward the esta-
blishing thereof; That I mean where he affirms ^g, that *if we confess our*
^g 1 Joh. 1. 9. *sins, God is faithful and just to forgive them.* For beside that that is a
Scripture which doth more immediately concern us, and from the force
whereof therefore we cannot easily shroud our selves; it supposeth con-
fession of sin to be, even by the new Covenant, the condition of for-
giveness, yea such a one without which we cannot expect the obtaining
of it. For how came the either *faithfulness* or *justice* of God to be con-
cern'd in the accepting of it, as we find by that Apostle that they are,
were it not that that Confession was a part of God's Covenant with us,
and as such therefore obligatory to us?

There

There being therefore no doubt to be made of the necessity of confessing our trespasses, which is the first of those Confessions I have said to be incumbent on us, it would in the next place be enquir'd (because otherwise we may erre in the management thereof) whether that Confession we are to make of sin ought to be only *in the general*, or to extend to those *particular* sins we find our selves guilty of. A question which will be of no very difficult resolution, if we reflect upon what hath been said concerning the grounds of Confession of sin, as elsewhere concerning the grounds of those *particular* Prayers, which we superadd to this more *general* one of our Lord. For if we ought to descend to particular requests, and such as are more agreeable to our own particular needs; if we ought to do so as a more *plenary* recognition of our dependance on him to whom we present them; then ought we to be as particular in begging the forgiveness of our respective offences, and consequently also in the Confession of them. Besides, when, as I shall afterwards shew, we are to confess them as *debts* as well as *trespasses*, as making us obnoxious to the divine vengeance, as well as violators of his Laws; when, consequently thereto we ought to confess them in the measure they are such, and agreeably to that degree of vengeance to which they do oblige us; Either we must, in our Confession of sin, descend to particular acts and circumstances, or we must, as to the guilt thereof, fall short of a due Confession of them: Because the guilt thereof depends upon those particular acts and circumstances, which we are so careful to conceal. But so that holy men have thought themselves oblig'd, may appear from some of those Confessions which the Scriptures present us with, and particularly the Books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*; In the former whereof we find a particular Confession of the Israelites *h* making affinity with *stranger Nations*, in the latter among other things of their *killing those Prophets of the Lord*, who had been sent to testify against them, and turn them to him.

h Ezra 9. 10.
8c.
i Neh. 9. 26.

Now though what hath been said, as to a particular Confession of sins, be to be understood with relation to *publick* Confessions, as well as to *private* ones, partly because there is the same general reason for them both, and partly because the Confessions before-mention'd were publick ones; Yet must it be acknowledg'd *first*, that that Confession whereof we speak is *more proper* for the *Closet* than the *Church*, because as the particular sins of private men may be more certainly known and enumerated, so they may be laid open before God without any thing of scandal, which publick Confessions cannot be so free from. It must be acknowledged *secondly*, that though that Confession, which is made in publick, ought so far as it may be, to be adapted to the particular sins of those, in whose name it is offered up, yet not so much to the sins of this or that particular man, as to those of that Body, for which it is made; Because publick Prayers, and consequently publick Confessions, are the Prayers and Confessions of that Body, and ought therefore to be suited to the general necessities and failings of it. Upon which account, as I cannot but disapprove of the practice of those men, who hook into publick Confessions whatsoever they can think some one or two persons of the Congregation to be guilty of; So I cannot but again commend the practice of our own Church as to this affair, which, though it prompts its members to a Confession of the breaches of those several Laws, which the Decalogue or ten Commandments contain,

1. Cor. 14. 16.

contain, yet refers the more particular application thereof to the breast of particular men, as by whom it is more proper to be made. For what hath the Body of an Assembly to do with the Confession of those sins whereof the generality thereof, at least, are no way guilty? And if it hath not, how comes it to be impos'd so indifferently upon it, and offer'd up as the Confession of it? For if the publick Prayers ought to have every particular mans *Amen* to them, as *St Paul* k doth plainly suppose, they ought in reason to be so fram'd in the whole and every part thereof, that every person in the Assembly may be able to do it, which they cannot be in a condition to do, if they have not a particular interest in it. Neither will it avail to say, with what confidence soever it hath been urged, that he, who prays in publick, is the mouth of the Congregation to God, and of every particular member of it; for as I readily grant that he is the mouth of the Congregation to God, and of every particular member of it collectively taken; So I say therefore, that he ought so to fute his Confessions to those whose mouth he is, that every individual person may assent unto them; Because so far forth as he departs from that, so far he makes himself not the mouth of the Congregation, but of those particular persons to whom he so futes himself. It must be acknowledged *thirdly*, that as publick Confessions are rather the Confessions of that Body, in whose name they are offer'd up, than of this or that particular member of it; so they ought therefore to be futed to the nature of that Body, in whose name they are so offer'd unto God. The result of which consideration will be, that inasmuch as the Church is, though not a sinless Body, yet a holy one, and such as is at least free from those grosser sins, which exclude men, while the continue in them, from all hopes of Salvation; he, who prays, is not, in those Confessions which he makes in the behalf of that Body, to take notice of any such sins as those. For beside that that Body must be suppos'd to be free from those, and therefore such a Confession no way proper for it; So to confess, is to incourage men to believe, that they may continue members of that Body, even before they are deliver'd from the pollution of them. And whether such constant Confessions as those have not *de facto* given encouragement unto men to entertain a good hope of themselves, even whilst they continued in those their sins, I shall leave it to all sober men to judge. Sure I am whatever is now done, a distinction was ever made heretofore, in the publick Prayers of the Church, between the different sorts of men that retained to it, and, as there was a particular Office for the faithful, and Prayers futable to them, so there was in like manner for those who were not as yet of them, as the Prayers of the *Catechumens*, and for those, who had by grievous sins fallen off from them, but were now returning to them, as the Prayers of the *Penitentes*. And God grant that, as our Church heartily wisheth for that Discipline ¹, by which the fore-mentioned distinction was made, so it may at length enjoy it, through the favour of those, who are and ought to be the nursing Fathers of it. And God grant too, that those, in whose hands the immediate Government thereof is vested, may both faithfully and carefully exercise that power they already have, as without which it is not to be expected that God should vouchsafe a farther power to them. Only if it should be said, that, till such a separation is made, it will be but reasonable for us to accommodate the publick Confessions to the condition,

¹ In the beginning of the Communion.

tion, even of those, that deserve to be excluded from the Congregation, because suffered to continue in it; As I will not be forward to deny the Allegation, so I say, that *that* may be done, without confessing in the name of the whole those more enormous sins they are guilty of. For our Church hath open'd a way to it, by premising each Commandment of the Decalogue to that *m Lord have mercy upon us*, which ^{m Communion Service.} it prompteth every person of the Congregation to utter. For he, who so prays with reverence to himself and others, will neither charge himself, or the whole with the grosser violations of them, nor yet exempt any one offence, which those, with whom he joins, are guilty of, from the matter of his Confession, or Prayer for pardon. By which and the like means that distinction whereof I before spake, may still be preserved, and yet the Prayers and Confessions of the Church not wanting to minister even to the necessities of those, who ought, if they had their due, to be excluded from joining in them. If it be yet farther said (and what more can be said, I know not) that what we urge as a thing of so great necessity seems not to have been thought so by those, who were the Authors of the Confessions before quoted out of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, because suited rather to the greater and worse part of the Israelites, than to the better, or to the whole? I answer, that, as those Confessions were but too agreeable to the necessities of the generality of those men, in whose name they were made; so they were made upon solemn and extraordinary occasions, and when the Jewish Nation may seem to have Apostatized from that Religion which they had been circumcised into. But as therefore they ought not to be drawn into example, any farther than the like extraordinary occasions shall invite; so who sees not, that a difference ought to be made between *such* Confessions, as are offered up upon extraordinary occasions, and when a Church is as it were to be built anew; and *such* as ought to be made, after a Church is well settled, and to become the standing and ordinary Confessions of it? For in the former there may be place for such Confessions, because of mens general depravation, and because they do not at all imply, that they, who represent them, look upon the sins commemorated in them, as sins wherein they may abide, and yet continue members of the Church. On the contrary, they give hopes to believe, especially where they are carefully attended to, that they, who so confess, will be as careful to break them off by repentance, and make way for Confessions of another nature. For what is this, but upon some extraordinary occasion, or at the beginning of a Reformation, acknowledged, can not be look'd upon as other, than the Confession of a people beginning to reform, and who, though at present under great guilt, because of the darkness, they have been lately in, yet mean not to continue so to be. But as there is not the like hope of those who are ever confessing the same scandalous sins, and therefore no reason for the Church to continue such in the Communion of her Prayers, or accordingly to provide suitable Confessions for them; So to join such persons with her more faithful Sons, as if they were of the same number, is but to encourage them to be vicious still; because giving them occasion to believe, that, though they continue such, they are a part of her Body, and that, notwithstanding those their sins, be partakers with her of her happiness. In Gods name therefore let such Unchristian Lives be rather with provided for, let them be provided for, when the

Discipline of the Church shall be restor'd, by such distinct Offices as the Ancient Church had, and, till then, by such Prayers and Confessions, as shew that the Church prayeth and confesseth rather for them, than with them, at least, as to such enormities of theirs, as are not consistent with a Christian state. For all, who are involv'd in the same Confessions, ought to be look'd upon, in some measure, as involv'd in the same guilt. Otherwise the Church did ill to argue against *Pelagius* from hence, that all of what quality soever, were under trespasses, and sins, as which otherwise they could not have been prompted to beg the pardon of. For if this tacite Confession of trespasses be not the proper Confession of every man that makes it, there might have been place for that subterfuge, which we find the *Pelagians* to have made use of, even that many, who had a concernment in this Petition, were taught thus to pray, rather upon the account of *other* men, than upon their *own*.

I have insisted somewhat long upon the *Confession of our trespasses*, which I have said to be the first of those, which ought to be made by us in this affair. But I will endeavour to make amends for it by my brevity in those that follow, and so much the rather, because they will not require any curious consideration by us. For who sees not that there is alike necessity of *confessing*, that those trespasses, whereof we speak, make us *obnoxious* to the *divine vengeance*, yea even to an *eternal* one? For beside the evidence we have for it from *St Matthew's* representing them under the notion of *debts*, and that Confirmation which *St Luke* gives it in the Close of his account thereof (for though he call these sins of ours by the name of *trespasses*, yet he sufficiently intimates them to be *debts*, because teaching us to pray, that God would *forgive us our trespasses*, inasmuch as we also *forgive every one that is indebted to us*.) We have equal evidence for it from that, which I have said to be the ground of the Confession of those trespasses, whereof we speak. For the ground of that Confession being the necessity thereof, in order to the declaring our dependance upon God for the forgiveness of them, there will be a like necessity of confessing the *demerit* of those trespasses, and that they make us *obnoxious* to the *divine vengeance*. It being by means of that, that we come to stand in need of forgiveness, or are under any necessity of depending upon God for it. Being moreover by the demerit of our trespasses made *obnoxious* to eternal, as well as to temporal vengeance, being consequently under so much the greater need of the forgiveness of those trespasses, and under so much the stricter dependance upon him of whom we beg it; By the same reason that we ought to confess their *demerit* in the *general*, we ought to confess it as to those *several* punishments, to which it doth expose us, and particularly (because that is the greatest) as to *eternal* ones. But so is there the like necessity of confessing, or acknowledging unto God, that we *cannot be delivered* from that demerit, or vengeance, but by the *mercy* and *goodness* of that God, to whom we are here taught to pray for it. For though the Confession of our trespasses, or the demerit of them, be enough to shew our dependance upon the mercy of another, as to the forgiveness of them, yet, to shew our dependance upon God for it, we must also either expressly or implicitly acknowledge, that the delivery of us from them must be from his grace and mercy; because that acknowledgment, and that alone, brings home our dependance

dance unto God, for the declaration whereof it is that all these services are imposed on us. Such evidence there is for the making of these two latter Confessions, as well as of the former one; And we shall find, that there is no less for our being particular in them, where we have opportunity so to be. For as we can never too much acknowledge our dependance upon God for that forgiveness of our trespasses which we beg; So that acknowledgment of ours will be very imperfect, unless we do upon occasion make a very minute acknowledgment of that vengeance to which they expose us, and of that mercy and goodness which is requisite on his part to deliver us from our obligation to it. As will appear more fully, if we reflect upon the way God made use of to procure us that forgiveness, which in this Petition we are prompted to desire.

The way being thus plain'd to the Petition that is now before us by a due consideration of those things I have affirmed it to imply; it will not be difficult to understand the sum of that which it expresseth, and which accordingly it teacheth us to desire. For forgiveness, as I have elsewhere shewn, being nothing else than the release of that debt which we have contracted by our trespasses, the sum of this Petition will be found to be the release of that obligation to vengeance, which we contracted by them, and particularly of our obligation to an eternal one. Only as that release will be but imperfectly understood, unless we have a more particular knowledge of it; so I should have thought my self oblig'd to attend to the investigation of it, were it not, that I have in a great measure prevented my self in it, in my discourse upon that Article of the Creed which proposeth the belief of it. It may suffice to say first, that as the Petition we have before us prompts us to beg indefinitely the forgiveness of our trespasses, so we are for that reason, as well as for others elsewhere mentioned, to beg for our selves, and others the release of all such trespasses, against which there is no exception of forgiveness, or of our praying for it. Which will consequently leave no trespass out of the number of those, for the forgiveness whereof we pray, but that which our Saviour calls *the sin against the Holy Ghost*, and St John *a sin unto death, and for which he would not say, that men should pray*. I say secondly, that as those trespasses, for the forgiveness whereof we pray, oblige us both to a temporal and eternal vengeance, so we are accordingly to beg of God, because forgiveness is the release of that obligation, that he would take off our obligation both to the one and the other: But still with a due regard to the nature of those obligations, from which we desire to be delivered, and to the declared will of God concerning the release of them. The consequent whereof will be first, our desiring more earnestly to be delivered from that obligation, which binds us over to eternal vengeance, than from that, which makes us obnoxious only to a temporal one; As, in the second place, our desiring, rather conditionally, than absolutely, to be delivered from the latter obligation; because, though there be presumption enough of our being licensed to pray in the general for the release of it, yea to hope for the obtaining of it, yet there is reason enough to suppose, from what I have elsewhere shewn, that in sins of a more scandalous nature, God may, and will retain, in some measure, our obligation to temporal punishment, and cause us to fall under it. I say thirdly, that, though that forgiveness, which we beg, be no other,

Explic. of the Creed. Article, Of the forgiveness of sins.

Ibid.

Op Mat. 12. 31, 32. q 1 Joh. 5. 16.

Explicat. of the Creed. Art. Of the forgiveness of sins.

f Rom. 1. 7.
1 Cor. 1. 3.
Gal. 1. 3.

t Rom. 8. 16.

e Explic. of the
Creed. Artic.
Of the forgive-
ness of sins.

in propriety of speech, than the release of our obligation to vengeance, yet it implies in it *a release from the vengeance it self*, as well as from our *obligation* to it. For our obligation being taken away, the other must also fall, because founded in, and depending on it. By which means it shall be equally lawful for us, yea incumbent upon us by this Petition, to pray also to be delivered from it: But yet with this difference, that so far as temporal vengeance is concern'd (for eternal vengeance cannot be considered as any other than a punishment) we pray rather to be delivered from it, in the *formal* than in the *material* notion of it, that is to say, as it is an *express* of wrath, and a *punishment of sin*, than as it is an *affliction to humane nature*; because in this latter sense it may be as great, or rather a greater blessing, than the taking it quite away, and ordainable both to our temporal and eternal welfare. And though there be not the like evidence of our praying for the *sense of this release*, as there is for the *release it self*, because it is neither the same with it, nor a necessary consequent of it; Yet I cannot but say *fourthly*, that there is reason enough to believe, that we are to look upon *that* also as included in it: Because, over and above the evidence we have elsewhere *f* for the praying for it; how great soever the blessing of this release may be in it self, and will shew it self to be at the great day of absolution, yet it will be of little comfort for the present, so long as the sense thereof is wanting, yea a discouragement to the desire of it, or the subduing of our impieties. Only let not men fancy to themselves, *that that Spirit of God*, which is the Fountain of all their Consolation, will *immediately* imprint that sense thereof on *theirs*, or indeed any other way than by *witnessing together t with theirs*, upon a due consideration of themselves, that they have in them those graces which qualify them for pardon, and which if they have, they cannot be without the other. For neither can we with reason expect any other impression of it, if God hath annexed the promise of forgiveness to certain qualifications in us, and thereby open'd to us a way to judge of our obtaining of it, and so also for obtaining a comfortable sense thereof; What may be acquir'd by the assistance of God's Spirit, in the use of ordinary means, being not to be expected from extraordinary ones, and much less, where there is so great a danger of mistaking the illusions of our own fancies for the suggestions of Gods Spirit, and no probable means of distinguishing them from the other. I will conclude what I have now to say concerning that forgiveness, which it is the design of the present Petition to prompt us to implore, after I have added *fifthly*, that being propos'd by the Gospel upon certain *terms* u to be *compli'd with* by us, but such as are not to be *compli'd with without the assistance of the divine grace*, we are consequently to be suppos'd, as to beg them of God *under no other*, so to beg *his grace and assistance* toward our performance of them. And thus far we have the stipulation of the present Petition to it, that though it prompts us to beg of God the *forgiveness of our trespasses*, yet it is upon condition of our *forgiving them that trespass against us*, and which now I will set my self to consider.

II. Now there are three things to be enquir'd into, as touching that *forgiveness*, which is suppos'd to be due from us *to the trespasses of others*; What that *forgiveness* of ours is, and to whom and to what trespasses it ought to extend, under what *notion* it is here propos'd to us, and the *reasonableness* of that proposal.

I. That

1. That we both may and ought to forgive those that trespass against us, this Petition doth manifestly suppose, and we have therefore reason enough to believe, that there is such a thing incumbent on us, and that it doth very well deserve that name. But what that forgiveness of ours is, or how it comes to be so entitled, is neither clear from this Petition, nor is otherwise very easy to define. For forgiveness being nothing else than the release of that obligation to punishment, which men draw upon themselves by their offences, it cannot be supposed to belong to any but him, to whom the power of punishing doth belong, and consequently neither to any but God, or those whom he hath vested with his Authority. As for the generality of men, to whom yet by the tenour of the present Petition, forgiveness doth equally belong, they have in strictness of speech no more power to forgive, than they have to punish, and we therefore to look out for some other forgiveness, which may be more properly predicated for them. For the discovery whereof, we are in the next place to consider, what this very Petition doth not obscurely insinuate to us, that, whatsoever that forgiveness is, it must be one that holds some analogy with that of God, wherewith it is here joined in it. For our Saviour, not only making use of one and the same word to denote it, but recommending it as both the condition of our begging the pardon of God, and an incitement to the obtaining of it, he must consequently suppose it to be a thing which holds some analogy with it, as which otherwise it would not have been proper to express by the same word, or represent as the condition of it. Now what that is, will best be judged of by the power there is in us to imitate that forgiveness, which is a true and perfect one. For so far as it is in our power to imitate a true and perfect forgiveness, so far no doubt we ought to go by the force of those Precepts which enjoin it on us, yea, to look upon it as the forgiveness intended by them. But from thence it will follow first, because we may go so far toward the imitation of it, that we ought to put on those bowels of mercy, which dispose Superiours to it, and prompt them to release that obligation to punishment, wherein they that trespass stand obliged to them. Which yet is no more, than what the Scripture doth expressly enjoin, yea, doth so, in order to that forgiveness, which we are now in the consideration of; St Paul, after he had premised *the putting on the bowels of mercy*, *the forbearing and forgiving y one another, if any man have a quarrel against any*. It will follow farther, that, in consequence of those bowels of mercy, and much more of that forgiveness which is here requir'd, we abstain from all avenging our selves, with our own hands, upon those who have trespassed against us. For beside that this is a thing which God reserveth to himself, and to those whom he hath invested with his Authority; forgiveness properly so call'd doth consist, especially in the suspension of that vengeance, and we therefore, if we are in a capacity to imitate it, as no doubt we are so far, to make it also a chief part of ours. It will follow thirdly, that we ought not only to abstain from avenging our selves with our own hands, but to abstain in like manner from endeavouring it by the hands of others, and particularly of God, and the civil Magistrate; As because it is in our power to abstain from such endeavours, so what we endeavour by the hands of others, is as truly our own act, as that which we endeavour by our own

a Mat. 18. 30,
35.

own. The result of which consideration will be, our neither soliciting that God, to whom vengeance originally belongeth, to execute it upon those that trespass against us, nor yet imploring the Magistrate, to whom next under God it appertaineth, to execute the same vengeance on them. And indeed as our forgiveness would otherwise be a very imperfect one, because the obligation, of which forgiveness is a release, is an obligation to God, and those that are invested with his Authority, and with whom therefore if we desire it may abide, we can very ill be said to forgive; so our Saviour seems to me to make it consist especially in the release of the injurious person from that obligation to vengeance, wherein he stands bound to God's Vice-gerents: Because describing men's want of forgiveness by the cruelty of that servant *a*, who cast his Fellow-Servant into Prison for not paying him the sum he ow'd him. For if his casting the injurious person into Prison were a due proof of his want of forgiveness, and as lively a representation of ours; that forgiveness, which is opposed to it, must consist in the release of those that trespass against us from any the like hardship and necessity. Which will consequently imply the release of them from the vengeance of the Magistrate, as well as from our own personal one; Because it is not in our power, but by the means of the Magistrate, to cast any man into Prison, and therefore neither to shew our forgiveness of him, but by *releasing* him, so far as in us lies, from that obligation of vengeance, wherein he stands bound unto the other, but however no way impeding the release of it. Besides, when all personal vengeance is perfectly forbidden us, as who are not at all entrusted with the repaying of it; when it must consequently be forbidden to us, though they, who trespass against us, do not prevent it by their repentance, which yet (as I shall afterwards shew) they ought to do, to make them partakers of our forgiveness, how is it possible to think that forgiveness not to consist especially in a release from publick vengeance? For if the release of personal vengeance be no more than we are obliged to, whether men repent of their trespasses or no, some other release ought to be understood, where in order to our bestowing it, there is requir'd a due repentance of the trespasser, and consequently the release of a publick vengeance. It will follow fourthly, that we ought not only no way to solicit the avenging our selves by others, but, where the trespass, whereof we speak, is a due object of it, to *endeavour also the forgiveness* of it by those to whom it more properly appertaineth. Which, as to God, is the more evident, because we are here taught to pray to him for the forgiveness of others, as well as our selves; and will be found to be no less evident, as to those who are God's Vicegerents, and who accordingly have, under him, the Administration of Vengeance; This as it doth yet more approach to the nature of a true and perfect forgiveness, because tending to the release of that obligation, in the relaxation whereof forgiveness doth consist, so being *no more* than is in our power to do, and therefore no more than *that*, which we ought to think our selves obliged unto.

It appearing from the premises, what the nature of that forgiveness is, which is incumbent upon us by the tenour of this Petition, it will not be difficult to shew *to whom*, and *to what trespasses* of theirs it ought to extend, which is the only thing farther observable in this our first enquiry concerning it. For if we are under an obligation of forgiving those

those that trespass against us, or are indebted to us, without any exception or distinction, we must be supposed to be equally obliged to lay aside the thoughts of vengeance, of what nature or quality soever those trespassers, or debtors are. For where the Law doth not distinguish, neither ought we our selves to do so, and therefore to look upon all trespassers as verily intended in our forgiveness, as if they had been expressly named. Though if we desire a more exprels proof thereof, we may furnish our selves from St Luke, because teaching us to say *b*, *And forgive our sins, because we also forgive every one that is indebted to us.* *b* Luke 11. 4. But from thence it will follow, that there was more of wit, than truth, or sound knowledge of Christianity in him who said *c*, that *though we read that we ought to forgive our Enemies, yet we do not at all read that we ought to forgive our Friends.* For if all that are indebted to us, or trespass against us ought to have a share in our forgiveness, neither can even a treacherous Friend, who may seem the most hard to be pardoned, be excluded from partaking of it. If again we are under an obligation of forgiving mens trespasses, as well as their persons, because it is those trespasses, and those alone, which make their persons susceptible of it; if that obligation we are under to forgive them have no exception of any trespass annexed to it, any more than there is of any committer of them; then ought we, by the former rule, to extend it to all trespasses whatsoever, yea to look upon it as so intended by our Saviour. But from thence it will follow first, which I doubt is not so often considered, that greater as well as lesser trespasses ought to have a share in our forgiveness, yea those, which, by reason of the enormity thereof, may seem more unworthy of it. Because how great soever they are, yet they are as nothing in comparison of those, the forgiveness whereof we beg of God, and to which therefore there is but reason to believe, that we ought to sacrifice all those resentments, which we may think to be due unto the other. And to this I no way doubt our Saviour did allude, when he represented the *debt unto the servant*, but as a debt of a *hundred d pence*, but that *of the servant unto his Lord*, as a debt of *ten thousand talents*. Sure I am that Lords saying unto his Servant *f*, *O thou wicked Servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me,* is both a farther indication of it, and a much more forcible proof that no trespass, how great soever, ought to be look'd upon as exempted from our forgiveness. For if the greatness of that debt, which is forgiven to us by God, ought to be a motive to us to forgive the trespasses of our Brethren, it will alike enforce the forgiveness, even of the greatest ones, because alike great in comparison of them. It will follow secondly, that as greater as well as lesser trespasses ought to have a share in our forgiveness, so trespasses which have been often repeated, yea as often as they happen to be so; because though the repetition thereof may make them much greater, yet it cannot make them more trespasses than before. But so our blessed Saviour hath elsewhere *g* expressly declar'd, upon occasion of St Peter's demanding of him, *how oft he ought to forgive his offending Brother, and particularly, whether he ought to do it till seven times.* For affirming that he was to forgive him, not only *till seven times*, but *to seventy times seven*; affirming farther that he was to forgive him *seven times in a day*, if he as often return'd and express'd his sorrow for it; he plainly intimated that no continuation, or repetition of offences ought to take us off from

c Cosmo D. of Florence.

d Mat. 18. 33.

e — 24.

f — 32.

g — 21, &c.
Luke 17. 3, 4.

from the forgiveness of them. Only as even God doth not forgive us our trespasses, but upon our repentance for, and acknowledgment of them, so it appears from what was but now quoted from our Saviour, that that forgiveness, which we ought to shew to others, is upon condition of their sorrow for those trespasses which they commit, and as sincere a declaration of them. And it appears too from the necessity there sometime is of the Magistrates executing vengeance, and, proportionably thereto, of our desiring and soliciting it, that our forgiveness, so far forth as it relates to the release of a publick vengeance, ought to be limited by such just and weighty reasons, as perswade the procuring the punishment of those, who trespass against us, as well as against God or other men. But other limitations than those, as it will be hard to find even of this sort of forgiveness, so let men take care that no private rancour corrupt their minds into such a belief, or intermix with those more weighty reasons which they seem to themselves to have attain'd. For so far forth that forgiveness, which they owe to others, will be endammag'd thereby, and they as certain to forfeit the forgiveness of God by it.

2. But because that forgiveness whereof we speak is not *simply* propos'd here, but *with relation to that other forgiveness*, which we are before taught to beg, therefore enquire we in the next place *under what notion* it is here propos'd, and which we shall find to be first, under the notion of a *condition* of our own begging of it, and of the *terms* upon which alone we are to expect it. For to our own Prayer for the forgiveness of God, he added a Law, saith St Cyprian *h. De Orat. Dominica.* *binding us under a certain condition and stipulation, so to beg the forgiveness of our own debts, as we also forgive our debtors; as knowing, that, what we ask for our own sins, can by no means be obtain'd, unless we also do the like to those that are indebted to us.* Which indeed is no more than the very form of this Petition justifies, but stands farther confirm'd by the explication our Saviour gave of it, immediately after his first delivery of it, and the account that is given of it by St Luke. For if it be true, as St. Matthew *i Mat. 6. 15.* tells us, that *unless we forgive men their trespasses, neither will our Father which is in Heaven forgive our trespasses*; if it be true in like manner, as the subjoining of that passage to the Prayer of our Lord shews, that we are so to interpret our Saviours teaching us to pray *forgive us our debts as we also forgive our debtors*; then is that forgiveness to be look'd upon as the condition of our own, and as such represented to us in, and by it. If it be in like manner evident from this Prayer's being propos'd to us both as a *pattern* and a *form*, that we are to beg forgiveness of God, as we forgive our Brethren; if it be so true, as I shall afterwards shew from St Luke's account of this Petition, that at the same time we thus pray we ought to profess our present forgiveness of those who have at any time trespassed against us, then are we alike oblig'd to beg it upon that score, as well as to believe, that it is not otherwise to be obtain'd. It is to be observed secondly, that as that forgiveness whereof we speak is propos'd to us as the *condition*, upon which we are both to expect and beg the forgiveness of God; so it is moreover propos'd to us *as one which we ought to bring with us*, either in the act, or purpose of it. For so (as was but now intimated) St. Luke gives us to understand, because teaching us to say, *And forgive us our sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us*; those last words being a profession of a present forgiveness

forgiveness, as well as a Declaration of our not desiring the pardon of God upon any other terms. And thus far we find by St *Mark* k, that our Saviour inculcated the bringing with us this forgiveness, that he made it indispensably necessary to all those, who had, at that instant, when they prayed, any quarrel against their Brother; as appears not only from his admonishing such to *forgive*, when they were addressing themselves to God, as that too in order to their own obtaining the pardon of God, but from his giving them yet more clearly to understand, that *unless they did so presently forgive their Brother, neither would their Father which was in Heaven, forgive their trespasses* against himself. So far therefore is our forgiveness of others pre-requir'd to the pardon of God, that we cannot either beg or expect the latter without bringing the former with us, either in the act or purpose of it. And they who only consider this Petition, as it is commonly express'd, will find themselves obliged to subscribe to it. For if that prompt us to beg a present forgiveness of God, it must consequently prompt us to as present a forgiveness of others, because suspending his forgiveness upon our affording of the other. I think I shall hardly satisfy the due intendment of this Petition, or rather of the latter clause thereof unless I add thirdly, that what is there suggested concerning our forgiveness of others, was intended as well as a *motive* to induce God to grant us his, as a *condition* of our own begging or expecting it. For what less can we well make of St *Luke's* teaching us to beg his pardon, *for I or because* we also forgive those who are indebted to our selves? That *Particle* having in it the force of an Argument, and, when therefore made use of to enforce a foregoing request, implying that, to which it is premis'd, to be urged as such to him, to whom the other is directed. This however is certain, that that forgiveness, whereof we speak, is here propos'd to us as a condition of our both begging and expecting the forgiveness of the Almighty; And we therefore to enquire into the *reasonableness* of that proposal, the third and last thing to be discours'd of.

3. Though what is there, which to an unprejudiced man can appear to be more reasonable, than that forgiveness, on condition of which we are here taught to ask that of God? For such no doubt it would appear to be, though that forgiveness, which is requir'd of us, were every way equal to that which we are taught to beg of God, and a forgiveness of equal debts and trespasses; Nature as well as Scripture having recommended it as an equitable rule, that what we desire should be done to us, we our selves should be as forward to do to others. But how do they comply with this rule, who, while they desire the forgiveness of their own sins, are unwilling to remit the sins of others, yea even to that God who forgives themselves? If the desire of pardon be rational in us, it must be so in other persons, and much more when God doth also become a Sutor for them. Thus, I say, it were easy to argue, though our forgiveness were equal to that of God, and a forgiveness of the like sins or trespasses, how much more when that which is exacted of us is, in this particular as well as others, so infinitely below that which we are taught to ask of God? We ask of God the forgiveness of *ten thousand talents*, yea of a debt which humane nature is not able to discharge; and God in lieu thereof requires our forgiving a *hundred pence*, yea a much more inconsiderable sum, if compared with the other. In which proposal if there be any thing

k Mark 11.
29, 26.

l Luke 11. 4.

of

of inequality, as there is no doubt enough, it is because God exacts not enough of us; forgive him this wrong. Lastly, as that forgiveness, for which our Saviour conditions with us, is infinitely inferiour to that which he allows us to ask upon it, or rather God by him; so it is a forgiveness which God hath prevented us in, both by giving his Son to procure ours, and making a tender of it. For well may we think our selves oblig'd thus to meet the forgiveness of God, when that forgiveness of his hath not only made the first step towards us, and ours; but advanced so far, as to put it into our power to grasp it, by shewing the like forgiveness, or rather a far less unto our brethren. So reasonable must it be thought to beg the forgiveness of God upon condition of our affording the like forgiveness unto others; So alike reasonable, for that cause, either to bring with us this latter forgiveness, or to give over either praying for, or expecting the former one; He, who denies that forgiveness to others, which he begs for himself, furnishing Arguments against himself, and such as are of more force to preclude his requests, than all he can say for himself can be to the furthering of them. For what excuse can any man alledge in the day of Judgment, when he is only judg'd according to his own sentence m, neither doth he suffer any other than what he himself hath done. I will conclude this Petition and my Discourse with a saying of the Son of Sirach, and so much the rather, because it will shew this to have been the reasoning of Mankind, before it receiv'd any light from the Doctrine of our Saviour. One man beareth hatred against another n, and doth he seek pardon from the Lord? He sheweth no mercy to a man which is like himself; and doth he ask forgiveness of his own sins? If he that is but flesh, nourish hatred, who will intreat for pardon of his sins?

m Cyprian. de
Orat. Dom. Ex-
cusatio tibi mul-
ta in the judi-
cii superest, cum
secundum tuam
sententiam ju-
diceris, et pro
feceris hoc et
ipse peccatoris.
n Ecclus. 28.
3, 4, 5.

And

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.

THE CONTENTS.

The thing, about which this Petition is conversant, shewn to be no other than temptation, and enquiry thereupon made what is meant by temptation, what by God's not leading us into it, and what by delivering us from it. The first of these resolved to signifie, or at least principally, a temptation to sin, and of which the Devil and not God, is both the Author and encourager; The second, in some measure, God's not leading us into the assault of it, but more especially his not suffering us to be overcome by it; The third, the same God's preserving us (if we have been only led into the assault of it) from the farther continuance, or prevalency thereof, or (if we have been also overcome) from being holden by it. This resolution followed by a more particular one; and where, after a minute account of what this Petition supposeth, as to our selves, or the tempter, or God, a like account is endeavoured of what things it prompteth us to ask, as to each of the respective branches of it. The Contents of the former branch thereof more especially enquir'd into, and declaration made of those assistances which are but necessary for the repelling of a temptation, and which therefore we must be suppos'd to ask, when we pray not to be led into it.

VWE were taught in the words before to beg of God the forgiveness of our trespasses, and, consequently thereto, his delivery of us from those punishments to which they do certainly expose us. And if we were permitted to end our Petitions there, there is no doubt we should pray as heartily against those trespasses of ours, as he, who taught us to pray, can be supposed to desire it of us. For who can be so much in love with his own irregularities, as to choose, together with them, the deserved punishment thereof? But as whosoever shall consider, that that forgiveness, which we are allowed to ask, is upon condition of our own forgiveness of the trespasses of others, must consequently allow that we ought to strive in some measure, against those very trespasses we desire the forgiveness of; So it is yet more apparent from the Petition I am now upon, because teaching us to pray against all future temptations to them. For if (as I shall by and by shew) that be the general intendment of the present Petition, it must be concluded to be as much our duty to pray against our own falling into them, as to be delivered from the guilt of those by which we were before ensnar'd. Whether therefore that be the general intendment of the present Petition is in the next place to be enquir'd into, and so much the rather, because we cannot otherwise come to understand what the more particular intendment thereof is, and what boons it prompts us to desire.

I. For the resolution of the former whereof we are first to know, that though the *Petition* now before us is made up of *two different* branches, yet is it *conversant*, in each of them, *about one and the same thing*: As will appear, among other things, from the Particle *but*, by which they are connected to each other. For being the word *but* is a note of opposition, being every opposition as such must be *ad idem*, that which we pray *not to be led into* and *to be delivered from*, must consequently be *one and the same thing*, as without which the opposition would be null. It is to be observed secondly, that as the *Petition* now before us is conversant, in each of its branches, *about one and the same thing*; so that *one thing* about which they are conversant is no other than that *temptation*, which we pray, in the former thereof, that God would *not lead us into*. For *temptation* being the thing, against which the former of these is level'd, and indeed the only clear thing which we are taught to pray against, either in the one or the other, it is in reason to be suppos'd to be it, from which we ought to pray *to be delivered*, as well as *not to be led into*. To attain therefore the due intendment of this *Petition*, and of each of the branches of it, we must in the next place enquire what is meant by *temptation*, and then what is meant by being *not led into*, and *delivered from* it.

a Gen. 22. 1.

Now *temptation* in the general is nothing else than making trial by some probable means how that person stands affected, whom we choose to make the subject of it. And it is either simply with a design to make the party discover what is in him, or, together therewith, to betray him into some inconvenience, into which we would gladly see him fall. In the former of these senses God may be said to tempt us, and is accordingly affirmed to have tempted *a Abraham*, because designing no other by that Command, which he laid upon him, of offering up his Son *Isaac*, than to make him discover whether there was in him that sincere regard of his Commands, which he made shew of in his actions, and a due belief of the promise he had made to him of making him a *Father of many Nations* by that very *Isaac* whom he commanded him to offer. A thing which that Command of his was well fitted to discover, and shew forth both to *Abraham* and the World. For that Command being in a thing which was contrary to his natural inclinations, and, beside that, seemingly destructive of that fruitful Progeny, which God had made him a promise of, there could be no doubt, but, if he compli'd with it, he had a due regard to his Commands, and as firm a belief of what he had promised concerning the other. For what doubt could there be either of the one or of the other, when such a thing as the offering up an only Son, yea, by one whom he was promised a posterity, was not at all stuck at by him? And indeed as things of that nature are the most apt trial of mens sincerity, and therefore the more likely to be made use of by him to whom this sort of temptation is attributed; So though God do not now tempt us by such Commands, yet he tempts us by the severer dispensations of his providence, and the necessity he frequently lays upon us of either submitting our selves unto them, or renouncing our obedience to him. Which is so true, as to the Oeconomy of the Gospel, that, in the Scriptures of the new Testament, from whence the account thereof must be fetch'd; *afflictions* and *tribulations* have frequently the name of *temptations*, yea that very word, without any other addition, is made use of to express them. Thus what is in St *Matthew* b when

b Mat. 13. 21.

tribulation

tribulation or persecution ariseth is by St. Luke c, who both records and ^{c Luke 8. 13.} expounds the same Parable, expres'd by a *time of temptation*; and *Te are they* (saith Christ d, speaking before of his mean and servile condition) ^{d — 12. 28.} which have continued with me in my temptations, that is to say, under those outward discouragements which I have met with in the World. He himself hath suffered, being tempted, said the Author to the Hebrews e, after he had spoken of his assuming our flesh f and blood to ^{e Heb. 2. 18. f — 14.} suffer in it; And The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, saith St. Peter g, that is to say out of troubles and afflictions, as appears both by his inferring it from Gods delivering of Lot from the fire of Sodom, and opposing to it his reserving the ungodly to the day of judgment. And by such means as these I no way doubt God may tempt even his own Children, whether by an immediate infliction of them, or by making use of the hands of others. But whether or no, or how far they are to be look'd upon as here intended, when we pray not to be led into temptation, shall then be enquir'd into, when I have given you an account of those other temptations, which I have said to be with a design of betraying men into those inconveniencies, into which we would gladly see them fall.

For the understanding whereof we are to know, that though God cannot be supposed to tempt any man to sin, or to those punishments which are the consequents thereof (for in this sense, as St. James tells us, *God neither tempteth h nor can be tempted with evil*;) Yet there want ^{h James 1. 13.} not those, who will be forward enough to do it, and so procure both our transgression and destruction. For this is first so much the business of the Devil, that he is for that reason stil'd the *i tempter*; he thus tempted our first Parents to eat of that Tree k which God had forbidden them, and David to number that people l, which God had committed to his charge. He thus tempted our Saviour to *Command stones m to be made bread*, and thereby to let go his dependance upon God, to ^{m Mat. 4. 3.} throw himself down from a Pinnacle n of a Temple, and, in fine, to fall ^{n — 6.} down and worship o himself. And that he is not less forward thus to ^{o — 9.} tempt other the Sons of men, is not only apparent from his going about p seeking whom he may devour, and which is not otherwise to be compass'd, than by drawing them to offend, but from the Scriptures stiling evil men q the Children of the Devil, and their works r the works of the Devil. For neither the one nor the other of these being to be produc'd ^{r — 8.} by him but by bringing mens own lusts to a compliance with, and consent unto him; because as sin is the immediate product of our own lusts s, so it cannot therefore be any otherwise entitled to the Devil, ^{s James 1. 15.} than as he may be suppos'd to influence, and excite them: If (as the Scripture speaks) sin and sinful men be, as such, the product of the Devil, it must be by the means of those temptations which he suggests, as which alone are able to influence the other. So many instances therefore as there are of sin in the World, so many proofs are there of the Devils thus tempting of us. Though, as there is no necessity at all of his always immediately tempting us, but by the means of some others whom he influenceth, so it is equally apparent, that men, like our selves do sometime take the office upon them, yea that we our selves prove tempters to our selves. Which is so true as to the last of these, that no man is effectually tempted, but when he is drawn away t of his own ^{t Ibid.} lust, and enticed into sin, whoever be the first suggester of it.

Now as when it appears what the several sorts of temptation are, it is but consequent to enquire which of them is to be understood, when we pray *not to be led* into it; so I shall not stick to affirm first, that we are rather to understand the *latter* than the *former*, those which are *also* with a design to betray us into sin and death, than those which are *only* with a design to make us discover what is in us. As will appear, if we consider first the subjoining of this Petition to that which teacheth us to ask the forgiveness of our trespasses. For teaching us before to fence our selves against the guilt of our several trespasses, by begging the pardon of him who alone can deliver us from it, what can be more reasonable than to think, especially when he immediately prompts us to pray against temptations, that he meant such temptations especially, as are temptations to those trespasses, the guilt and obligation whereof he before taught us to beg a deliverance from: This as it is a sense which makes the Petitions to connect most aptly, so being the most likely to be intended by him who was the *wisdom of the Father*, yea who hath given no small proof thereof in the due disposition of the former ones. The same is yet more evident from our Saviours teaching us immediately after to pray (for so the *Greek* u imports) that God would be pleas'd to deliver us either from *the evil* or *the evil one*. For there being nothing so eminently evil as the *evil of sin*, nor any thing therefore which can better deserve the title of *the evil*, which is that which is here made use of by our Saviour; what can be more reasonable than to think, that he intended the evil of sin, and consequently (because this, and the former Prayer are but branches of one and the same Petition) that he intended no other by that temptation we pray against, than a temptation to that so signal evil? But then if we consider the *Greek* as importing *the evil one*, which is a sense those words are equally capable of it, if we moreover consider that title as a known *Periphrasis* x of the *Devil*, and which we cannot be ignorant that he doth eminently deserve; so we shall find yet more reason to understand the temptation before spoken of, as a temptation to sin and impiety: This being the temptation, which gives him the title of the *Tempter*, and which indeed is the only one, that is likely to be expected from him. Agreeable hereto is the interpretation of *Tertullian*, one of the first of those who commented upon the *Lords Prayer*, and who, by reason of his Antiquity, may be presum'd to be no incompetent judge of the meaning of it; He explaineth the temptation, here pray'd against, by that y which is suggested to us by the *tempter* or the *Devil*, yea a temptation to those very *trespasses*, which we pray'd before for the forgiveness of. I say *secondly*, that as we have reason enough to understand the temptations here spoken of rather of such as are with a design to draw us into sin, than of such as are only intended for the discovery of what is in us, so we are consequently rather to understand such as are offered to us by the Devil, than those which are offered to us by God; Because though the Devil may have a design to draw us into sin, yet God cannot be suppos'd to entertain any such. I say *thirdly*, that we are therefore also to accept, (or at least from being understood here) such temptations of God as proceed immediately from him, or come to us by such instruments of his, as we have no cause to disallow of; Because neither God, nor they, can be suppos'd to have any design of seducing us into sin, which is the temptation here intended.

Upon

u Ἀλλὰ πῶς
ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ
πειρασμοῦ

x Mat. 13. 19:
comp. with
Luke 8. 12.

y Adfectu ad
plenitudinem
tam expedite
orationis, ut non
de remittendis
tantum, sed etiam
de avertendis
in totum
delictis supplica-
remus, Ne nos
inducas in ten-
tationem, id est
ne patiaris nos
induci, ab eo u-
tiq; qui sinas.
Ceterum absit
ut Dominus ten-
tatore videatur,
Diaboli est,
& infirmitas,
& malitia. De
Orat. Cap. 8.

Upon which account, if God should lay upon us any harsh Command, as he sometime did upon *Abraham*, or think good to visit us, either by his own hand, or by that of an Angel, with the temptation of afflictions; It will become us rather to submit to it, than to pray not to be led into it, but however not to reckon it in the number of those temptations, which we do here pray not to be led into. If those temptations may be at all pray'd against, it must be only so far forth, as they are inconsistent with that temporal happiness, which the *fourth Petition* prompts us to seek after, and must be judged of by the *due sense* of that Petition, and the *measure* of their opposition to the subject matter of it. I will add *fourthly*, that as the temptations of God before-spoken of come not under the rank of those, against which we are here taught to fence our selves; so neither such, wherein he makes use either of the Devil or evil men, any farther than they may be improv'd by them to the betraying us into sin, because so far forth only the temptations here intended. Upon which account we do not only find men exhorted to rejoice in those more innocent temptations of afflictions, and persecutions, though for the most part, no doubt, brought upon them by the Devil, but *St Paul* moreover forbidden to pray for the removal of such a one, though conveyed to him by the Ministry of *Satan*; because however it might be design'd by the latter, God had fortified him against the attack of it, by that proportion of grace which he had vouchsaf'd him. The result of which observations will be *fitly* the directing our Prayers especially against such temptations as by *false reasonings*, or the bait of *external pleasures* endeavour to draw us off from God, and engage us in many *foolish and hurtful* lusts; these as they are purely the temptations of the Devil, so tending most apparently to lead us into sin, which is that, for which we are here taught to pray not to be led into the other. If other temptations, beside those, fall under the present deprecation, it is (as was before noted) as they symbolize with these in betraying us into the like trespasses and offences. One only thing there is, which may seem to prejudice this Interpretation, and that is the Interpretation of the *Catechism* of our Church, and which, as to me at least, must be look'd upon as very considerable, because proposing to my self to explain and defend it. For though that may seem, in a great measure, to give countenance to the former one, because making it a great part of the design of this Petition to beg of God to *save and defend us in all Ghostly dangers*, and to *keep us from all sin and wickedness, and from our Ghostly Enemy*; Yet it may seem, by other expressions of it, to extend it alike to other temptations, even to such as are purely afflictive; Witness its making it also a part of the same Petition to pray against *bodily dangers* as well as *Ghostly*, and against *everlasting death*, as well as either. For what is this but to make all temptations *whatsoever* things alike intended by it, whether they be such, as are also temptations to sin, or have no such relation to it? But as nothing hinders us to believe, that the interpretation before given was intended as an interpretation both of this and the foregoing Petition; partly because all it says before, toward the interpretation of the former, is only that God *would be merciful to us and forgive us our sins* (which is rather the reciting of its words, than any interpretation) and partly because forgiveness consists in a release from those afflictive evils, which are afterwards commemorated: So if we put that sense upon it, we

2 Cor. 12. 7.
&c.

1 Tim. 6. 9.

we shall find nothing at all in it, which is inconsistent with our own. For so the keeping us from such evils, as are *purely afflictive*, may be the interpretation of the Petition of *forgiveness*, as the *keeping us from sin, and wickedness, and from our Ghostly enemy*, the sense of that which respects *temptations*, and that evil which they betray us into.

This therefore being the notion of that *temptation* about which the present Petition is conversant, enquire we in the next place what is meant by being *not led into*, or *delivered from* it, which are the things we are here prompted to desire. For these two things being found out, the sense of the whole Petition will be so, and we shall not only be able to attain a general knowledge of his intendment, but be moreover in a capacity to discover all those particulars, which it doth either suppose or involve. To the discovery of these therefore I will now apply my self, and first of the meaning of that, which is the *first* in order, and by which we must judge of the meaning of the *other*. And *lead us not into temptation*.

Now as there are two notions, wherein this first expression of it may be again considered, to wit either with respect to that *temptation* against which we pray, or with respect to *him* of whom we desire not to be led into it; so if we consider it in the former of those, we shall find it to denote these two things, *our not being brought within the reach of its assaults*, or *not being overcome by them*, though we are. That I reckon as a part of its intendment, even *our not being brought within the reach of its assaults*, is because as the expression is capable of that sense, so there may be cause enough for the desiring of it, partly by reason of that trouble it brings with it, and partly because of that far greater danger that attends it. For what should hinder us in *some measure* to pray against any thing, by which either our present peace, or future welfare may be impair'd? But beside our desiring of God not to be brought within the reach of its assaults, which I have said to be the first of those things, which are intended by the present phrase, we are also to desire of him, yea to look upon as principally intended, *our not being overcome by them, though we are*; This as it is in some measure evident from the unsuitness of praying altogether against the assaults of temptation, and which I shall in due place confirm, so becoming yet more evident from the Prayers of the *Ancient Hebrews* in this particular, and the Scriptures making use of the like phrases to denote rather our being overcome, than being assaulted by temptations. For if the Petitions of the present Prayer were borrowed by our Saviour from those of the *Ancient Hebrews*, as *Drusius* b, and our *Gregory* c shew; If this among the rest appears to have been borrowed from them, as the similitude there is between the one and the other will not suffer us to doubt; Then ought we, in reason, to interpret it conformably to that sense, which those *Ancient Hebrews* put upon it, and consequently also to that, which we have now represented as the principal one: Because, as the same *Drusius* d hath observ'd, they generally express'd it by not being led into the *hands*, or *power* of temptation, which shews our being overcome by it to be the thing especially pray'd against. Agreeable hereto is the language of the Scripture, if not in the very same phrase, yet at least in those which are equivalent to it; Witness, in particular, its making use of the word *tempted* to denote our being overcome by it. For thus when *St Paul* exhorts e that *if a man be overtaken*

b Not. ad Mat. 6. 9, &c.

c In Not. & Ob- serv. in loco aliquot Script. Cap. 38.

d In Not. ad Mat. 6. 13.

e Gal. 6. 1.

in a fault, they, which are spiritual, should restore such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering themselves, lest they also be tempted; It is manifest, that we ought to understand thereby our being overcome by the suggestion of the like temptations to us: Because to be simply *tempted* is so far from being a just motive to restore him who hath been overtaken, that, on the contrary, the consideration of it (provided we our selves escape being foiled by it) would make us the less apt to pity him; Our own escape prompting us to believe, that he, as well as we, might have withstood the assault of it, and consequently is the less worthy of our compassion. In like manner are we to understand the word *tempted*, and the same St Paul that useth it, when he tells his *Thessalonians* f, that he had sent to know their Faith, lest by some means the tempter had tempted them, and his labour had been in vain. For what fear could St Paul have of having lost his labour upon them, merely through the fear of the tempters having tempted them, unless by *tempted* were also meant their being overcome by him? The overcoming of a temptation serving rather to shew the powerful effects of his Ministry, and of that grace by which it was influenced. Only if any man desire a yet farther confirmation of the present notion by the allegation of a phrase which comes yet nearer to our own, it will not be difficult to furnish him with one from our Saviours admonishing his Disciples g, and particularly St Peter h, to watch, and pray, that they entered not into temptation. For as there is no material difference between that Petition and the present one, and therefore the sense of that to be thought no inconvenient one of this, so it is not difficult to believe that by *not entering into temptation* we ought to understand *our not entering* into the power of it, and so being overcome by it: Because the Disciples entering into the assault of that temptation, whereof our Saviour spake, was not only known by him to be perfectly unavoidable, but to be moreover upon its approach, and against the force whereof therefore he thought it no more than necessary to fortifie them, by a present praying, and watching against it. By being not led into temptation therefore, which is but a phrase of like importance with the former, we are principally to understand our not being so led into it, as to be overcome by its assaults, and nothing else therefore remaining to us to consider, as to our desire of it, than the respect it bears to him, to whom it is directed, and with what propriety, or soundness of speech, we may be supposed to ask of God, that he would not lead us into temptation.

For the resolution whereof we are to consider, that as the temptations here spoken of are temptations to sin, and consequently such temptations, as are immediately suggested to us by the Devil, and cannot indeed be suggested by any other, and much less by God; So we are therefore to understand what is here supposed concerning Gods leading us into them, of Gods leading us into his hands, and giving us up to be either assaulted, or overcome by those temptations which he suggests. Now though the former of these may be easily imagined to consist with Gods hatred of sin, and particularly with the Scriptures affirming that he *tempteth no man to it*, because at the same time he leads us into the assault, he may furnish us with sufficient grace to resist the force of it (for thus we find the *Spirit of God* i to have led our Saviour into the Wilderness, to be tempted by the evil one). Yet what shall we say for Gods so far leading us into the power of the Devil, and those temptations

f 1 Thes. 3. 5.

g Mat. 26. 40.
h Ibid.i Mat. 4. 1.
comp. with
Luke 4. 2.

tions

tions he suggests (which yet the present Petition suppoſeth) as to make thoſe temptations of his become our ruine, and betray us into the intanglements thereof. For what is this, but to make God no leſs a tempter than the Devil, yea to make him the principal one? Becauſe, *in effect*, the tempter of the tempter himſelf, and an inſtigatour of him to that work, to which he knows him to be too prone, and ſo a promoter of our ruine by it? Which if any man can believe of God, he may perhaps, with congruity enough, beg of him not to be ſo led, but I doubt with little hopes of ſucceſs. He, who can find in his heart ſo to lead, being not very likely to be diverted from it by our Prayers, and much leſs to be ſo far prevail'd upon, as to be perſwaded thereby to deliver us from the entanglements thereof. That therefore being a ſenſe no way worthy of God, that I ſay not alſo, in the ſtrictneſs of it, utterly inconfiſtent with the divine perfections, we are in reaſon to look out for one, which may in ſome meaſure answer the expreſſion here made uſe of, and yet offer no violence to the other.

Now there are two things, which may, with equal truth and pertinency, be affirmed of that God, to whom we are here taught to addreſs our ſelves. 1. That he may permit the Devil to exert ſuch a power, as will be of force in it ſelf to produce our ruine. 2. That he may withhold or withdraw that grace, which is neceſſary for the reſiſting of it, and upon which our being enſnared by the Devil will follow as unavoidably, as if we were led into the temptation by God himſelf. The former of theſe is taken notice of by *Tertullian* and *St Cyprian*; the firſt of all thoſe who are known to have Commented upon this moſt excellent Prayer; *Tertullian* k after thoſe words, *Lead us not into temptation*, adding by way of interpretation, *suffer us not to be ſo led by him, who tempteth us*, as *St Cyprian* repreſenting the Petition it ſelf in theſe ſofter words l, *suffer us not to be led into temptation*, whether as ſo reading it in ſome *Latin* Verſion of that time, or tending it as his own *Expoſition* of it. Now in this ſenſe there can be no doubt, but God may lead us into temptation, if he may be ſaid to lead us, who only ſuffers another to do it. Becauſe, as he no way contributes either to the temptation, or our fall by it, ſo, if he ſuffers us to be ſo led, it is no more than he is priviledg'd to do, by our either original, or actual ſins; theſe naturally deſpoiling us of all title to his protection, and conſequently making it lawful to him to permit us to the temptations of the other. If there be any thing to impugn this interpretation, it muſt be its not answering the importance of that expreſſion, which it pretends to be an interpretation of. But with how little reaſon that can be alledged here, will appear if we conſider, that it is not unuſual with men to entitle thoſe to the doing m of any thing, who ſuffer it to be done, when it was in their power to hinder it. For the Scripture often ſpeaking, even concerning God, as we our ſelves are wont to do concerning one another, neither is it at all to be wondred, that it ſhould repreſent God as leading us into thoſe temptations, into which he only ſuffers us to fall, becauſe it is alike certain, that it was in his power to have hindred it, and that if he had ſo done, we could not have fallen into them: By which means our entering into temptation becomes as certain, as if God had indeed led us into it. If it be farther ſaid (as it may) that men are then only intitled to the cauſing of what they ſuffer to be ſo, when they are under an obligation to hinder it, and upon

k De Orat. c. 8.
Adiectis ad plenitudinem tam
expeditæ orationis ut
supplicaremus,
Ne nos inducas in tentationem, id est, ne nos patiaris induci ab eo utique qui tentat.
l Illud quoque neceſſarie admonet Dominum, ut in oratione dicamus. Et ne nos patiaris induci in tentationem. Cyp. de Orat. Dom.

m Qui non prohibet peccare, cum poſſit, jubet.

upon the sole account of that obligation; by which means Gods suffering us to fall into temptation cannot so properly be term'd the leading us into it, because he is under no obligation to hinder it: I answer, that that is indeed true, but that it doth not at all hinder the sufferance of God to be call'd a leading into temptation, or prove his leading into it to be more. For as the Scripture, speaking of God in the language of men, must consequently make use of such modes of speech, as cannot, in strictness, be predicated of him; So it is an acknowledged rule, and accordingly allow'd of in all those Texts, which attribute the members of a humane body to God, that those things, which are spoken of God after the manner of men, must be understood in a sense which is not unworthy of the divine Majesty. By which measures if we proceed here, neither will Gods suffering us to be led into temptation cease to be intitled a leading into it; yea though there be no obligation upon him to hinder it; nor will the Scriptures affirming him to lead us into temptation imply that leading of his to be any other than a sufferance. For if the Scripture, speaking of God after the manner of men, must consequently make use of such modes of speech, as cannot in strictness be predicated of him, what should hinder us from thinking, that it makes use of such a mode of speech, when it represents him as leading us into temptation, and consequently that it may so affirm of him upon the account of his suffering us so to be led, yea though there be upon him no obligation to hinder it? And if, on the other side, it be an acknowledged rule, that those things, which are spoken of God after the manner of men, must be understood in a sense which is no way unworthy of the divine Majesty: What is said concerning his leading us into temptation, ought in reason to be understood so too, and therefore also not to be thought to imply any other than a sufferance, because other than that cannot well be attributed to him. It may suffice, that he who forbids not those evils, which he may, is both look'd upon and spoken of as a Commander of them, and that agreeably to that mode of speech, God may be said to lead us into temptation, when he only suffers it to be; yea though there be not upon him, as there is upon men, an obligation to hinder it. But other concurrence than that as it will not be safe to attribute to him, of whom the Scripture expressly affirms, that he *neither tempteth in, nor is tempted with evil*; So there lies no obligation upon us, from the phrase here us'd, to affirm any other concurrence, or to deny his suffering us to be led, to be the due importance of it, because there is not in him that obligation to hinder it, which occasions *mens* suffering any evil to be interpreted as a leading into it: What the Scripture speaks of God in the language of men being not strictly to be understood, and much less in such a sense as is no way worthy of the divine Majesty. This only would be added concerning that *sufferance* of God, which we have said to be intended by his leading us in to temptation, that we understand not thereby such a one as consists in a bare non-opposition to the natural efforts of the Devil, but such a one as consists rather in the relaxation of that restraint which God holds over him, and other such noxious beings. For whereas God, as the great Lord and Superintendent of the World, must be supposed to have an eye to, and hand over all such beings as may be in a capacity of acting contrary to his mind and will; in order to the suffering of these to act according to their

n James 1. 13.

malicious inclinations, there must not only precede a bare non-opposition to their actings, but a relaxation too of that restraint which he holds them in, and a remission of his rigour towards them. Which though it be in it self no other than a sufferance, and as such represented by us; yet as it is such a sufferance (as I shall by and by shew from *St. Cyprian*) as is also a kind of *leave* or *power* to the party suffered, so will serve yet farther to shew, even upon the account of this sufferance, the propriety of our begging of God, that he would not lead us into temptation: Because, though it be the Devil rather than God who leadeth us into temptation, yet he cannot so lead us till God loose both his hands and feet from that restraint wherein he holds him, and so give beginning to the exerting of his temptations, and to our trouble, if not vanquishment by them. If the phrase of Gods leading us into temptation may be thought to import any thing more, it is only (as was before noted) his withholding or withdrawing from us that grace which is necessary to resist it, and upon which our being ensnared by the Devil and it, will follow as unavoidably, as if we were really led into it by himself. And in this sense I no way doubt God may lead us into temptation, yea that the phrase of leading us into it, will become yet more proper by the affirmation of it. For what should hinder God from withholding, or withdrawing his grace from those, who have either not employ'd, or abus'd it? Or hinder us from intitling such a withholding or withdrawing of it, a kind of leading into temptation? Because, though that withholding or withdrawing have no influence upon the temptation, or upon our fall by it, and so cannot in strictness be entitled a leading into it; Yet the success of that temptation, and our fall by it, follows upon it as unavoidably, as if it were really influenced by it. But as it ceaseth not for all that to be any other than a sufferance upon the part of God, in respect of the temptation, and our miscarriage by it; because the temptation produceth its effect, through its own natural force, and the pravity of those persons, on whom it falls: So it is but such a sufferance, as our either neglect, or misuse of Gods grace licenseth him to give way to. For what can be more reasonable, or just, than to withdraw his grace from those, who do either neglect or abuse it? By such ways and means as these may we, without any great difficulty, or danger, look upon God as a Leader into temptation, and accordingly beg of him, that he would not so lead our selves. But other ways than those as it will be hard to find out, which are not perfectly inconsistent with the divine purity, and goodness, or not easily reconcileable with them; So he, who shall carefully avoid the entrenching upon those (though with the hazard of calling in question some of the more mysterious dispensations of his providence) shall in my opinion make the most prudent, as well as the safest choice: It being much more pardonable to deny Gods efficiency in some things, than to charge him with concurring to that, which he professeth to abhor. However, as there can be no great harm in contenting our selves with what we are sure of, till we attain the like certainty concerning other the ways of God; so what I have already said concerning Gods leading us into temptation will furnish us with matter enough to frame an effectual Prayer against it; He, who begs of God neither to let loose the Devil upon him, nor to withhold his own grace, begging that which will be sufficient to preserve him from those temptations, against which he is here taught to pray.

One only thing remains toward the general explication of that Petition, which we are now upon the consideration of; and that is, what is meant by being *delivered from evil*, or rather from *the evil one*, and his *temptations* to it. Which, agreeably to the double sense of *lead us not into temptation*, will be found to be alike capable of a double one. For deliverance, as such, having a regard to some evil, and, in the Petition I am now upon, to the evil of temptation; being moreover to be considered with reference to that evil, as a thing we were before led into; such as is that leading into temptation, which we suppose to have preceded, such consequently must we suppose the desired deliverance to be. By which means the deliverance here prayed for will be either a deliverance from the continuance or prevalency of its assaults, supposing that to be the only sense wherein we were led into it; or, if we have been overcome by the force of it, a delivery from being holden by it, and kept under the Dominion of it. And it may not unfitly be illustrated by this following Paraphrase of the whole, (and which, as it seems to me to be the most plain and clear, so ought therefore to be look'd upon as most likely to have been intended.) Do not thou, O God, whatsoever my former trespasses have deserved, suffer me to be tempted to new ones, and much less so far to be tempted, as to be drawn into the Commission of them. But if, for that, or any other reason, thou shalt hereafter think fit to do so, yet step in to my rescue, and either deliver me from being any farther assaulted by the temptation, but however from being foiled by it; or, if I have been already foil'd, from being holden under the power of it, and continuing a slave to it, as I have been master'd by it.

II. Having given this *general* account of the intendment of this Petition, and of each of those branches whereof it is compos'd, proceed we to a more *particular* Explication of it, and which that general account before given will help not a little to the clearing of. In order whereunto, I will again enquire, what things it doth *suppose*, and what things it prompteth us to *ask*.

1. Now there are *three* sorts of things which this Petition *supposeth*, answerably to the *three* sorts of persons, who have some way or other an interest in it; those which concern *our selves*, or the *tempter*, or *God*.

That which it *supposeth as to our selves*, is *first* our being in danger from the power of temptations, yea continuing so to be, even after we become the *Children* of God, and have the privilege of calling him by the name of *Father*. For were it not for that, there would be no need of our praying not to be led into temptations, and much less of praying to be delivered from them; Every deliverance, as such, supposing a preceding danger, but this, which we are here taught to ask, such a danger also whereby we have been overtaken, which is too sad a proof of our obnoxiousness to it. As indeed, what being *is* there (God only excepted, and those Angels or Saints in Heaven, whom he hath now established) what being, I say, is there, which is not in danger from temptations, which is not obnoxious to their assaults, and as liable to be overcome by them? For even our first Parents in Paradise found, by too sad a proof, that they themselves were not out of the reach of them; And how much less may we think our selves to be so, who beside that possibility of falling, wherewith our first Parents were Created, have, by their fall, and our own, contracted another sort of

weakness, and which exposeth us yet more to become a prey unto them. But because there neither hath, nor can well be any doubt of that, our frequent lapses by temptations, as well as the nature of many of them, making it too too apparent, that we are in no small danger by them; Therefore take we notice, in the second place, of that which hath not been thought so clear, but which, as this Petition doth equally suppose, so is indeed the immediate ground of all that we are here taught to ask; even our own natural inability to resist the force of temptations, as well as our being in danger from them, and capable of suffering by them. For were it not for that also, yea for that especially, there would be no necessity of begging of God, not to lead us into them, or deliver us from them when he had; because our own innate force might secure us against their assaults, and, though not preserve us from being in danger by them, yet from becoming an actual prey unto them. And it ought the rather to be observed, because it was so by the *Ancient Church*, yea made use of, when time was, against the errors of *Pelagius*. That of *St Cyprian* shall lead the way, as that too, not only because of the antiquity of the man, but because of the fulness of his testimony.

o *Cyprian. de O-*
rat. Dom.

When, saith he o, we ask that we come not into temptation, we are thereby admonished of our own weakness and frailty, because taught so to ask, lest any man should insolently lift up himself, lest any should proudly and arrogantly assume ought unto himself, or take to himself the glory of his own confession, and passion. Whereas the Lord himself, teaching humility, said, Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation, the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak, that so, whilst a submissive and humble confession goes before, and the whole is given to God, whatsoever is thus suppliantly asked, with the fear and honour of God, may by his goodness and mercy be accomplished. Thus that Father reason'd, before the Adversary of the divine grace had shewed himself in the World, and thereby furnished future times with an argument to maintain it with. And how weighty a one the Fathers thereof thought it, these following testimonies of theirs (as I find them cited by *Vossius* p) do sufficiently declare.

p *Histor. Pelag.*
Lib. 2. Part 2.
q *De libero ar-*
bitr. p. 756.

The Lords Prayer, (saith *Orosius* q) admonisheth to ask, both that our debts may be forgiven, and that we may not be led into temptation; The one, that past faults may be expiated, the other, that future ones may be avoided. Which though it be not done, unless there be also a will, yet, that it be done, our will alone sufficeth not. Therefore, for this matter, neither a superfluous nor impudent Prayer is offer'd to the Lord. For what is more foolish, than to pray, that thou maiest do that, which thou hast in thine own power to perform? Thou, O *Julian*, saith *St Augustine* r, after your manner, even that which is the product of your error, acknowledge not the grace of God, but in the forgiveness of sins, so that, for the future, by free will man may make himself just. But this the Church doth not say, which cries all of it, as it hath learn'd from its good master, Lead us not into temptation. He saith it not, who says, Now we pray unto the Lord, that ye do no evil, He saith it not, who saith, I have prayed for thee, O *Peter*, that thy Faith fail not. For after that manner grace causeth us not to offend, rather than wipes away those sins which we have committed. In fine, this was not only the reasoning of this, or that particular Father, but, as we learn from the forequoted *Vossius* f, of a just Assembly of them. For after this manner did a Synod of *Carthage* express it self t, in an Epistle of theirs to *Innocent the First*. It necessarily follows from their sacrilegious disputations,

r *Lib. 2. conti-*
poster. Julian.
resp. p. 450.

f *Histor. Pela-*
gian. lib. 3.
Part 2. p. 329.
t *Apud August.*
Ep. 92.

that

that neither ought we to pray, that we enter not into temptation, which the Lord both admonished the Disciples of, and made a part of that Prayer, which he hath taught us. For if it come to be in our power by the possibility of nature, and the abatement of the will, who sees not that it is vainly ask'd of the Lord, when those things are beg'd by Prayer, which are obtain'd by the force of nature already made? From whence as it appears, what was all along thought of that *Petition*, which we are now in the consideration of, so how strongly it implies our own natural inability to conflict with those temptations we are here taught to pray against. I may not omit thirdly, because alike supposed by it, that we are not only naturally unable to resist the temptations of the Devil, but unable too to resist them without a *present* concurrence of the divine grace, over and above those gracious qualifications of Soul, which he hath before furnished us withal: Because as God must work in us to *do*, as *Phil. 2. 13.* well as *will*, so there would not otherwise be any need of our thus constantly imploring his deliverance from those temptations we are at any time led into.

From those things, which this Petition supposeth as to our selves, pass we to that, which it suppoeth as to the *Devil*, and which we shall find to be of as comfortable consideration to us, as the other are apt to beget in us an humble opinion of our selves, and a distrust of our own natural force. For from thence it will also appear, that the *Adversary* can do nothing against us, unless God be pleas'd to suffer him, yea unless as St Cyprian speaks *x*, he have a power or leave for it from God. For though (as was before observ'd) that *leading*, which is here attributed to God be no other than a *sufferance*, because other than such cannot be safely ascrib'd unto him: yet being a sufferance, which consists not so much in a non-opposition to the Devil, as in the releasing of that restraint which God holds him in; unless God do in a manner give leave to him, as well as no way hinder him, he cannot so much as assault us, and much less be able to subdue us. And it stands yet farther confirm'd to us by the account we have of his practice, when he would exert those temptations, which we are here taught to pray against. For why otherwise should he present himself before God, as we find he did y in order to Job's overthrow, and alledge before him Job's serving God rather upon the account of that prosperity he enjoy'd by him, than any real piety? Why should he make it his business, as we find he doth *z*, to accuse the Brethren before God day and night, yea desire of the same God (for so Tertullian a interprets it, and the Text it self shews) that he might have the sifting b of St Peter, as a man sifteth Wheat? Why all this, I say, but that (as the same Tertullian discourseth) even that sifting is so far from God, that it cannot be gone about without leave from him, and unless he give a faculty for it? And if this be, in truth, the Devils Case, as to all those temptations which he exerts, neither is his power so tremendous, as it is commonly deem'd to be, because not only under the controul of that of God, but exerted not in the least without a permission from him.

x De Orat. Dom. Quia in parte ostenditur, nihil contra nos adversarium posse, nisi Deus aucte permiserit, ut omnis timor noster, et devotio, atq; observatio ad Deum convertatur, quando in tentationibus nostris nihil male liceat, nisi potestas inde tribuatur.
y Job 1. 6, 8, 9, &c.
z Rev. 12. 10.

a Tertull. De fuga in persecut. Cap. 2. Sic et in Apostolorum facultatem tentationis postulavit, non habens eam, nisi ex permisso. Si quidem Dominus in Evangelio ad Petrum,

Ecce, inquit, postulavit Satanas uti cerneret vos velut frumentum: verum ego rogavi pro te ne deficeret fides tua Quo ostenditur, utrumq; apud Deum esse, et concussionem fidei, et protectionem, cum utrumq; ab eo petitur, concussionio a diabolo, protectio a filio. b Luke 22. 31, 32. 'Ιδὲ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐζητήσας τὸ ὑμᾶς, τὸ σπείρειν, ὡς τὸν σῖτον. 'Εγὼ δὲ ἰδὼν ὅτι οὐ δύναμις ἐλάττω ἐστὶν ἐν σοὶ

I will conclude what I have to say concerning those things which are here suppos'd, when I have admonish'd, that it is in like manner suppos'd

pec'd as to God, that our greatest danger, even in respect of temptations, is from him, as *by whom* we are led into them, and *without whom* we cannot be so; that our deliverance from them must be so too, as of whom, and whom alone we are here taught to ask it; that, consequently thereto (as we learn from St Cyprian in the place but now quoted) *all our fear, and observance, and devotion, ought to be turned towards him*, that of him we ought to beg *not to be led* into temptation, and *to be delivered* from it, and which (what they more particularly import) is in the next place to be shewn, and shall accordingly be my business to declare.

2. Now there being, as you see, two things which this Petition prompts us to ask, though relating to one and the same object, for the more distinct explication thereof I will consider them apart, and first of all, because that is the first in order, and the foundation of the other, *Gods not leading us into temptation*.

I said before, in my general explication of it, that by Gods *not leading us into temptation* we were in some measure to understand his not leading us into the assault of it, his not suffering us so far to be endanger'd thereby, as to be solicited, or shaken by it. I find no reason at all to retract that assertion of mine, but rather to abide by it, and insist upon it. For if even purely afflictive evils may, in some measure, be pray'd against (as how many instances are there of such Petitions in the devotions of holy men?) what doubt can remain of our praying alike against those, by which we may be also ensnared? But as I did not then declare in what measure we are to desire such a freedom, nor indeed could think fit to do so, because intending only a general explication of it; So I must therefore now set my self to the Declaration of it, and so much the rather, because this first sense of that Petition will furnish little else toward a more particular explication of it. For that importing no more, than Gods restraining the Devil and his instruments from assaulting us by temptations, or rather continuing that restraint upon him and them, which he generally holds them under; and that restraint being a thing, which concerns God rather than us, and ought therefore to be permitted to him, as to the management thereof; There will be little else for us to enquire, than in what measure we are to desire that restraint, and together therewith our own freedom from their assaults. And here in the first place it is easie to see, that, though we may be allow'd to beg of God a freedom from such assaults, yet with an entire submission of our selves therein to the good will and pleasure of the Almighty: Because as it is not simply evil to be tempted, nor necessarily training us into that which is, so it is perfectly inconsistent with the methods of his providence, and not less with the glory of Gods grace, to desire a perfect freedom from it. For who sees not that God doth, at least, suffer such temptations to shew themselves every where? Yea, that the glory of his grace would be very much impair'd, if we enjoy'd a perfect freedom from them? But as therefore we are not so to pray *not to be led into temptation*, without submitting our desires in that particular to the good pleasure of the divine will; So neither, secondly, with respect to all temptations whatsoever (as which is impossible for us to expect, and to the detriment of the divine grace to desire), but only with respect to particular ones; As, in those again, rather to such temptations, whereof we have great cause to be apprehensive, than to those,

those which are of easy assault. It favouring more of poorness of spirit, and indeed unwillingness to imploy those graces which God hath given us, to desire to be freed from these, than of any just care of our spiritual welfare. But as there is generally so much trouble to us from the assault of temptations, and so much danger too, considering the weakness of humane nature, that it may be very allowable, in some measure, to desire a freedom from it, provided that be done with submission to the divine will; So some temptations are so potent, and may have shewn themselves to be such by their frequent victories over us, that we may yet more allowably desire a freedom from their assault, or at least till God hath furnished us with a greater ability to resist them, than we find our selves Masters of at present.

The second thing intended by Gods *not leading us into temptation*, is his not so leading us into it, as to suffer us to be overcome by it. A Petition, which, no doubt, we may absolutely and universally ask, or, at least, so far, as the present infirmity of humane nature will permit; and concerning which therefore we shall need only to enquire, what it may be thought to imply, which I conceive to be these four things; Our begging of God the graces of his Spirit, and particularly those graces of it, which are directly opposite to the temptation prayed against; Our begging of him to suit the temptation to that measure thereof he hath bestowed upon us, or to give us such a measure thereof, as may be answerable to the force of the other; His stirring up in us, at the time of the conflict, those graces which he hath bestowed upon us; And continuing to us those graces and excitations, as long as the temptation continues to molest us. For if, as I come now to shew, all these be no more than necessary to preserve us from the force of it, then must we be suppos'd to beg them of God, when we pray that we may not be soled into it, as to be master'd by it.

To begin with the first of these, even the graces of Gods Spirit, and particularly such graces thereof as are directly opposite to the temptation pray'd against; Where who is there, that sees not the necessity both of the one, and the other, to preserve us from being master'd by it? For to say nothing at all of our natural inability to contend with it, and which will consequently infer the necessity of an ability from God, which is that we here mean by the graces of his Spirit; That these are no more than necessary to our withstanding the temptations of the Devil, St. Paul plainly shews c, where he exhorts men to *put on the whole Armour of God, that they may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all to stand.* For if the graces of Gods Spirit are a part of that Armour, as his reckoning thereto d *the breastplate of righteousness, and the shield of faith* shews; if they ought to be put on, that we may be able to withstand, and having done all to stand; Then must they be look'd upon as necessary to preserve us from that foil, for the avoiding whereof we are here taught to pray, that we may not be led into temptation. Not less evidence will there be of the necessity of those particular graces, which are directly opposite to the temptation pray'd against; these, and these alone being the proper Armour of the part assail'd, and consequently so much the more needful to repel the temptation that comes against it. The consequents whereof will be, that if we are at any time tempted to covetousness, we ought more particularly to pray that God would give us a contented mind, and a love of
more

Eph. 6. 13.

d — 24: 16.

more noble blessings, than any this World contains; If to pride and vanity that he would give us a due sense of our own vileness, and of those either natural, or moral defects, which we cannot but be conscious of; If we are tempted to presumption, that he would make us apprehensive of his justice, and the abhorrency he hath of all sin and impiety; If tempted to despair, that he would give us the grace to look up to his mercy, as well as upon our own sins, or Gods severity toward them. For though other graces, beside these, may be necessary enough for the repelling of the temptation; yet these, by the immediate relation they have to the part assail'd, must be look'd upon as much more so, and consequently more especially desir'd.

But because whatever defence there may be in the graces of Gods Spirit, yet it must be look'd upon as more, or less, according to the measure we are possessed of them; and because therefore nothing hinders, but the temptation may exceed the force of them, because exceeding the force of that measure wherein they are possessed by us; Because, lastly, our own experience bears witness to the weakness of some mens graces, and the incompetency thereof to answer the force of some temptations; Therefore to preserve our selves from being so led into temptation, as to be overcome thereby, we must consequently be suppos'd to beg of God, that he would either suit our temptation to that measure of grace he bestows upon us, or give us such a measure of grace as is answerable to the force of the other. As without which we cannot be in a condition to withstand it, and therefore neither, in a condition of avoiding the being foiled by it. For though we are not without a promise of *not being tempted above what we are able* (for St. Paul tells us *e*, that God is *more faithful*, than to suffer us so to be) yet as that and all other promised blessings is upon condition of our asking of them, and we therefore no less obliged to beg, that we may not be so tempted, than if we had no promise of it; so the promise thereof must also be upon condition of our rightly employing that grace which was before bestow'd: The parable of the talents *f*, and our Saviours affirming that *to him that hath, or maketh use of them, shall be given, but from him that maketh not that use thereof shall be taken away even that he hath*, making it evident that we cannot always expect, with the like certainty, the possession of such a measure of grace, as may answer the temptation that comes against us. By which means there will not only be requir'd so much the more sorrow for our past offences, and particularly for our ill use of the grace before bestow'd, but so much the more reason to be earnest with God for suiting our temptations, and graces, and either making the temptation to sink down to our low proportion of grace, or that rise up to the measure of the other.

But let us suppose, that we are not altogether unprovided of those graces, no nor yet of that measure of them, which may otherwise answer the force of the temptation; yet as even these may prove insufficient for the repelling of it, if they be not *stirred up*, and alarmed to the conflict, so there is reason enough to believe they may need a stirring up by God, as well as we find *g* they do such a *stirring up* by our selves; As will appear if we consider either the assertions of the Scripture, or the no condition we may be sometime in to stir them up our selves, through the sudden surprize of that temptation, which comes against us. For beside the Scriptures affirming in the general, that *without Christ we can*

e 1 Cor. 10. 13.

f Luke 19. 12.
26.

g 1 Tim. 1. 6.

b Joh. 15. 5.

can do nothing, and therefore neither (as I should think) stir up those graces that are in us, without a previous excitation from him both of us, and them; We are more particularly assured by it, that the Spirit of God and his assistances must work in us to *do* i, as well as to *will*, *those operations*, which savour of piety and worth, as well as that holy *will* from whence they immediately proceed. Which assertion of the Scripture could not in any measure be justified, if God did not, at least, excite the wills of men to the exerting of those operations, which he is affirmed to produce. But then if we moreover consider the no condition we our selves may be in to stir up our own graces, by means of the surprize of that temptation we are to encounter, so we shall see yet more reason to believe the necessity of begging of God, that he would stir up those graces in us. For that, which comes suddenly upon us, leaving no place for any serious consideration, and therefore neither (because that is the only means we have to do it by) for the stirring up of our own graces; Either those graces of ours may act without any excitation (which is to make them the vertues rather of *natural*, than *free* agents) or they must have an excitation from God. I deny not indeed, but it may be much in our power, even in the *case* we speak of, to excite our own graces; partly because no temptation can so surprize us, as to bereave us of all opportunity of consideration, and partly because less consideration may serve, where there hath been, as no doubt there ought, an habitual pre-consideration of the deceitfulness of sin, and as habitual resolutions against it. But as there are not very many who can boast of such considerations and resolutions, and therefore neither many, who can promise to themselves, that they shall, by the force of their own considerations and resolutions, be able to withstand so sudden an assault; So there are such remains of corruption, even in the best of men, that they may sometime be supposed to give a greater force to the temptation, than any actual or habitual considerations and resolutions can be thought to bring against it. In both which Cases, if God do not awaken our graces by a more forcible suggestion of his Spirit, they will but ill contest with those temptations that come against them, yea fall not infrequently under the Dominion of them.

I think I should not need to add (were it not for the more distinct explication of this branch of the Petition) that what necessity there is of Gods both graces and excitations of them in order to the repelling of temptations, the like necessity there must be of continuing them to us, so long as those temptations continue to molest us; Because if the former be but necessary to the repelling of temptations, it must be alike necessary for God to continue them, so long as the temptations continue to molest, inasmuch as for so long time they will be to be repelled by us. But as being to declare, what those particular Petitions are, which this more general one includes, it cannot but be thought expedient to make as particular an enumeration of them; so I cannot therefore but admonish, that when we beg of God *not to lead us into temptation*, we must be supposed to beg as well the continuance of his graces, and excitations, as we do the first collation of them.

A particular account being thus given of the former branch of this Petition, even that which prompts us to ask that God would *not lead us into temptation*, it remains that I do the same (at least so far as is necessary) for that which prompts us to pray that we may be *delivered* from

it. Which latter branch of it may, as was observ'd before, either denote our deliverance from the continuance, or prevalence of its assaults (supposing that to be the only sense, wherein we have been led into it) or, if we have been overcome by the force of it, a delivery from being holden by it, and kept under the dominion of it. As touching our delivery from any farther assaults of temptation, which is the first of those things which seems here to be desir'd, I shall need only to say, that we are not to desire it under any other terms, than we were taught before to desire that we might be led into them; Because how troublesome soever it may be thus to continue under its assaults, yet is it not simply evil to continue in that condition, nor necessarily betraying us into that which is. On the contrary God's grace may manifest it self the more, if we, notwithstanding the importunity thereof, continue to stand out against them. And for being delivered from the prevalence of its assaults, which is the only thing farther, that can be thought to be intended by it, it is but the same in sense with that of our desiring, that God would *not lead us into temptation*, and the more particular explication thereof therefore without any farther trouble to be fetch'd from thence. If there be any thing worthy a new consideration, it must be our praying to be delivered from temptation (or rather from the dominion of it) after we have been master'd by it.

Now there are three things to be enquir'd into, as touching that deliverance, which we are now upon the consideration of, first, what ground there is for begging such a deliverance, secondly, what ground there is for believing it to be here intended, as thirdly and lastly, what it may be thought either to suppose, or import.

The ground of the first of these is partly the original frailty of humane nature, and partly that farther imbecillity which it may be supposed to contract by the force of those temptations it is at any time master'd by. For being by nature inclinable to evil, and but imperfectly delivered from it by that sanctification we now partake of; becoming thereby so much the more obnoxious to the force of temptations, because only soliciting us to those things to which we are inclinable enough of our selves; It is not difficult to imagine, but we may be sometime master'd by temptations, and so far forth therefore stand in need of a deliverance from them. Being moreover by those foils of ours brought under the power of those sins, into which our temptations have led us, being brought under the power thereof with the consent of our own wills, as, without which, we could not have been foil'd, either by the one, or the other; being lastly, by that consent of the will not only in danger to be depriv'd of that grace we sometime had, but disposed to continue in those sins to which we before consented, it is as easy to see, that we shall stand in need of a deliverance from them, yea that we shall stand in need of a deliverance from God: Because as we are under the power of them, so we are so with our own will; and cannot therefore be delivered from it, but by a change of that will, and which nothing but the grace of God can be supposed to effect.

There being therefore no doubt to be made, that it is not without ground that we beg such a deliverance from God, enquire we in the next place whether there be not equal ground to believe that that very deliverance is intended here. Which that it is, will appear in part from the necessity of our asking of it, but more from the purport of the

Prayer

Prayer it self, and particularly of that Petition, which we are upon the consideration of. For beside that so necessary a deliverance cannot well be thought to be forgotten by him, who pretends to give directions for Prayer, yea for such a one, as respects those very *temptations*, about which that deliverance is conversant; Beside that this very Prayer, by prompting us to ask daily the *forgiveness of our trespasses*, supposeth we shall daily fall into them, and may therefore be thought as well to prompt us, to beg a deliverance from the dominion of them; That *deliverance*, which this Petition teacheth us to ask, respecting a precedent *leading into temptation*, yea such a leading as I have shewn to bring us under the dominion of it, must consequently import the breaking of that Dominion, and freeing us from being holden by it. By which means nothing else will remain for us to enquire, than what this deliverance may be thought either to suppose or import, and what accordingly we may be thought to beg of God, when we desire that deliverance of him.

And here in the first place it is easie to see (because we cannot otherwise obtain a deliverance from it) that we are to look upon as a part of our desires, a due sense of the nature of those sins, under the dominion whereof we are holden, and which accordingly we beg a deliverance from. For there being no appearance, on the one hand, of Gods delivering us from that Dominion, without a desire and endeavour in our selves to accomplish the same deliverance; nor any likelihood, on the other, of our setting our selves to the doing of it, till we become in some measure sensible of the severity of those task-masters, under whose Dominion we are holden; we must consequently be thought to beg of God a due sense of the nature of our offences, how irksome their Empire is, and how difficult, or rather impossible to be born. It will be no less easy to see secondly (because equally prerequir'd to our deliverance, and by the Gospel particularly enjoyn'd in order to our obtaining of it) that we are equally to desire of God a hearty sorrow in our selves, for having given up our selves to the dominion of those sins, against which we pray; It being as little to be thought, that we should ever quit that dominion, which we find no regret in our selves, for having given up our selves unto. It will be as easie to see thirdly (because neither that, nor any other deliverance can be compassed without setting our selves against our Oppressors, nor that gone about, or, at least, not with any hopes of success, without a resolution so to do, and a proportionable ability for it) that we ought to beg of God a full purpose of mind to oppose our selves against them, and such graces and abilities as may qualify us for the doing of it, that he would stir us up to the exercise of those graces and abilities, that he would do it so much the more effectually, by how much the more difficult it is for us to prevail against them; We being not now to hinder an Enemy from bringing us under his dominion, but to deliver our selves from a dominion he hath already acquired over us, and by which we shall be the more indispos'd to contend with him, or overcome him. But as if these things be obtain'd of God, we shall not need to doubt of a deliverance, because furnished with all necessary assistance for it; so we shall have so much the more occasion for the use of that *Doxology*, which comes in the last place to be explain'd.

For the first and principal object of the Christian religion is the
redemption of the soul from the bondage of sin, and the
restoration of it to the image of God. This redemption is
not to be understood in a legal sense, as if it were a
merit of works, but in a moral sense, as if it were a
purification of the heart. The law of God is the rule of
our conduct, and the standard of our righteousness. But
the law is not the end, but the means. The end is the
glory of God, and the happiness of his people. The law is
the way to that end, and the standard by which we
are to measure our progress. The law is not to be
observed in a literal sense, but in a spiritual sense.
The law is to be written on our hearts, and to be
the principle of our actions. The law is to be the
rule of our lives, and the standard of our
righteousness. The law is to be the way to the
glory of God, and the happiness of his people.

It is not to be understood in a legal sense, as if it were a
merit of works, but in a moral sense, as if it were a
purification of the heart. The law of God is the rule of
our conduct, and the standard of our righteousness. But
the law is not the end, but the means. The end is the
glory of God, and the happiness of his people. The law is
the way to that end, and the standard by which we
are to measure our progress. The law is not to be
observed in a literal sense, but in a spiritual sense.
The law is to be written on our hearts, and to be
the principle of our actions. The law is to be the
rule of our lives, and the standard of our
righteousness. The law is to be the way to the
glory of God, and the happiness of his people.

It is not to be understood in a legal sense, as if it were a
merit of works, but in a moral sense, as if it were a
purification of the heart. The law of God is the rule of
our conduct, and the standard of our righteousness. But
the law is not the end, but the means. The end is the
glory of God, and the happiness of his people. The law is
the way to that end, and the standard by which we
are to measure our progress. The law is not to be
observed in a literal sense, but in a spiritual sense.
The law is to be written on our hearts, and to be
the principle of our actions. The law is to be the
rule of our lives, and the standard of our
righteousness. The law is to be the way to the
glory of God, and the happiness of his people.

It is not to be understood in a legal sense, as if it were a
merit of works, but in a moral sense, as if it were a
purification of the heart. The law of God is the rule of
our conduct, and the standard of our righteousness. But
the law is not the end, but the means. The end is the
glory of God, and the happiness of his people. The law is
the way to that end, and the standard by which we
are to measure our progress. The law is not to be
observed in a literal sense, but in a spiritual sense.
The law is to be written on our hearts, and to be
the principle of our actions. The law is to be the
rule of our lives, and the standard of our
righteousness. The law is to be the way to the
glory of God, and the happiness of his people.

AN
APPENDIX
TO THE
EXPLICATION
OF THE
LORDS PRAYER,

As it is a Part of, and Interpreted by

THE
CATECHISM
OF THE
CHURCH of ENGLAND.

Containing An

EXPLICATION
OF THE
DOXOLOGY
THEREOF.

AN
APPENDIX
TO THE

EXPLICATION

OF THE

LORDS PRAYER.

As it is a Part of and interpreted by

THE

CATECHISM

OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Containing An

EXPLICATION

OF THE

DOXOLOGY

THEREOF.

AN
 APPENDIX
 TO THE
 EXPLICATION
 OF THE
 LORDS PRAYER, &c.
 Containing An
 EXPLICATION
 OF THE
 DOXOLOGY
 THEREOF.

**For thine is the Kingdom,
 and the power, and the
 glory, forever and ever.**

THE CONTENTS.

Entrance made into this Doxology, by an enquiry concerning the Authority thereof, and which, after the offer of several reasons for the due establishment of it, is also vindicated from the many exceptions that are made against it from the several Topicks, and particularly from the omission of it in the Catechism of the Church of England. The explication of that Doxology next taken into consideration, where again it is considered first in its more simple and absolute intendment, and then in the relation wherein it here stands, as to those Petitions which precede it: In the former

former whereof it is shewn to have been intended as a form of praise, in the latter, as an apt reason to recommend our requests to God, and as effectual a motive to encourage our hope of the obtaining of them. The sense, and force of each particular thereof, for that purpose, enquir'd into; and God's Kingdom, and power, and glory, shewn to be as proper to enforce our Petitions, as to furnish us with fit materials for the setting forth of his honour.

WE began our Prayer, as was but meet, with an address to, and an acknowledgment of the glories of the divine Majesty; we continued the same with our earnest wishes, and Prayers for the exaltation of them, and particularly of his name, and Kingdom, and will; Reason therefore would, as well as the Prescript of our Saviour, that we should close it with the same blessed employment, and terminate in the honour of our Maker. For being God is no less the end, than the beginning, or middle of all things, the Omega, than the Alpha, or My of the World, it was but requisite that he should possess the same place with us, and, as he is all in all in himself, so be all in all in our thoughts and Prayers. Only because there are who allow not of this *Doxology*, and must therefore equally disallow of the former inference from it; and because the *Catechism* of our Church seems so far to consent with them, as neither to repeat, nor explain it; I will, before I set myself to the Explanation of it, shew it to be a part of the present Prayer, and, together with that, what I conceive to be the reason of our *Catechism's* omission of it.

Now there are three things, which persuade the *Doxology* I am now upon to be a part of the present Prayer, first its being represented as such by the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, secondly, it or the like being an usual *Epiphonema* or close of the Prayers of the Ancient *Hebrews*, and indeed of the Common ones of all the *Eastern* people: thirdly, its being the only express form of praise, or thanksgiving, which this Prayer of our Lord will be found to afford us. That it is represented by St. *Matthew* as a part of the present Prayer, will need no other proof than an inspection of his Gospel, or at least of the *Greek Copies* of it: these, as they are no doubt the most Authentic Copies of it, so generally representing this Prayer with the *Doxology* now in question, and thereby, as I should think, giving sufficient testimony to it: One positive proof of its being a part of the present Prayer, being of more force to conclude it such, than many negative ones can be of its having no such relation to it. I say secondly, that as this *Doxology* is represented by St. *Matthew* as a part of the present Prayer, or at least in the generality of the *Greek Copies* of his Gospel; so that or the like *Doxology* was an unusual *epiphonema* or close of the Ancient *Jewish* ones, which will be a farther confirmation of its being to be accounted such. For if it was not unusual with the Author of this Prayer to borrow from the Jews, and transcribe their both Precepts and Institutions into his own; if he be found so to have done, as to the several Petitions of the present Prayer, as *Drusus* and our *Gregory* a shew; then may we look upon this *Doxology* as not improbably his, if that, or the like *Doxology* appear to have been in use among them. Which that it was, we have not only the Authority of the forementioned *Gregory* (and who moreover represents such a *Doxology*

a See the Explic. of the foregoing Petition.

ology as the close of the Prayer of Noah, and of the generality of the Eastern people's) but also of another b no less versed in those matters, b *Lightsol: Ho- ra Hebraic. in Eveng. Mat. c. 6. v. 13.* and who tells us that this Doxology, *blessed be the name of the glory of his Kingdom for ever*, was an usual, and ancient close of the publick Prayers of the Temple, and returned by the people instead of an *Amen* to them. To all which, if we add, what is yet more notorious, that there is not in the present Prayer any express form of praise or thanksgiving beside it, so we shall be yet more confirm'd in our belief of this *Doxologie's* being a part of it, and not (as some have vainly deem'd) afterwards added to it. For praise and thanksgiving being a no less necessary part of our addresses, than Prayer properly so call'd can be suppos'd to be; being moreover no where provided for in the Prayer that is now before us, unless it be in that *Doxology* whereof we speak; either that *Doxology* must be look'd upon as a part of it, and as of our Saviours own addition, or it must so far forth be look'd upon as an imperfect form, and pattern, which the reverence we bear to the Author of it, as well as what I have before c said concerning it, will not suffer us either to affirm or suppose.

c *Introdu&.*
Discourse con-
cerning the
Lords Prayer.

I deny not indeed that there have been those, who were otherwise perswaded, yea that our own Church may seem to have been of their opinion, because, in the place I am now upon, neither repeating, nor explaining it. I deny not farther, that they have had very plausible reasons for their opinion, and which may perhaps be allow'd to be so far forth of force with us, as to hinder us from condemning those who have not the same reverend opinion of it. But as there is equal reason to believe, that our Church is not positive, either in admitting, or excluding it, yea that it rather inclines to the admission, than the exclusion of it; so whosoever shall consider the reasons of those who oppose this *Doxology*, will find they are no way answerable to the Arguments for it. For will they say (as some have done) that there is not that Authority for it from St. Matthew, which we pretend to advance, because some Greek Copies want it, and the generality of the *Latine* ones? That indeed may pass for an objection, which will require an answer from us, but which is (as I conceive) not incapable of a satisfactory one. For amidst the many Copies of the Greek of St. Matthew's Gospel, the various readings whereof are exhibited in the sixth Volume of the *Biblia Polyglotta*, there are but two, where this *Doxology* is pretended to be wanting, and one of them, even that of Beza, so stigmatized by himself d, that no man of sense will lay any stress upon it, where it shall be found to differ from almost all the rest. And for the *Latine* Copies wanting it, which is the only thing farther alledged, it ought still to be look'd upon as of far less force, because as they are not of equal Authority with the Greek, so we have to oppose against them the Authority of the *Syriack*, and which, as it is in itself of great Antiquity, and credit, so may be thought in Company of the Greek (from which no doubt all the rest were borrowed) to outweigh all the *Latine* ones. Will they then object (as they very well may) the Authority of St. Luke, and whom we our selves cannot deny to have omitted this *Doxology*, as well as the *Latine* Versions of St. Matthew's Gospel? But neither will this, how momentous soever, be found to be unanswerable, and much less of equal force with the Authority of St. Matthew; Because, whereas St. Matthew is positive for its being a part of the Lords Prayer, and thereby

d *In Epist. ad Acad. Camabr. Premissa. Less. Varians, Grac. Novi Testam. Vol. 6. Bibl. Polyglor.*

thereby leaves no place for the evading of his Authority, *St. Luke* offers nothing but his own *silence* for the rejection of it, and of which if a good account may be given, even that little force, which it seems to have, will be easily extorted from it. Now there are two reasons which may be given of that *silence* of *St. Luke*, without so much as granting that our Saviour, in that his second repetition of this Prayer, omitted this *Doxology* thereof. First, that the Prayer had been before set down by *St. Matthew* at full length, and did not therefore need any accurate repetition of it. And secondly, that that Prayer was now so well known by the common usage of it, that that account which he gave of it, if not a far less, might suffice for the deciphering of it. For if *St. Matthew* had before this time given an account of the Lords Prayer, and thereby made it the less necessary for *St. Luke* to make a strict rehearsal of it; if the Prayer itself by constant usage, as well as by the Doctrine of *St. Matthew*, was now known to the generality of the faithful, then might there be reason enough for his omission of the *Doxology*, as which might otherways be sufficiently known. Sure I am whosoever shall compare *St. Luke's* account of our Saviour's *Sermon upon the Mount* with that of *St. Matthew*, and particularly the short account he gives of the *Beatitudes* that begin it, with that which was before given by *St. Matthew*, will find reason enough to believe that it was no unusual thing with him, to be brief in those things, which had been before sufficiently accounted for by the other. But let us suppose (what I am apt enough to believe to have been the truth) that *St. Luke* in this account followed exactly the discourse of his Master, and omitted the present *Doxology* upon no other reason, than because our Saviour himself did not now mention it; Yet will it not even thence follow, that it ought to be look'd upon as no part of it; especially after *St. Matthew* hath expressly annexed it to it. For as our Saviour himself might then omit it, because he had before given a sufficient account of it, and thereby superseded an exact rehearsal of it, so he might omit it too upon the account of its being usual with the Jews, according as was before observ'd; to close their several Prayers with that, or the like *Doxology*. For that made it so much the less needful for him to commend it anew to their practice, as which the custom of their Nation did sufficiently prompt them to. However our Saviours omission of it then, cannot make it cease to have been delivered by him before, and therefore neither to be look'd upon as having a relation to the present Prayer, and, if not a necessary part thereof, yet tending to the completion of it. Will the opposers of this *Doxology* object lastly, as indeed that is the only thing farther considerable, that *Tertullian* and *St. Cyprian* take no notice of it, in their Comments upon this Prayer, nor, as it should seem by the *Latin* Versions of *St. Matthew*, the generality of the *Latin* Church; That there is no mention of it in *St. Cyrils* short Comment on it, nor it may be in some others of the *Greek* Fathers? Yet as the *Generality* of the *Greeks* acknowledged the *Doxology*, as appears from the *Constitutions of the Apostles*, the *Liturgies* of their Church, and *St. Chrysostome* h; So such of the one and the other, as did omit the mention of it, might do it upon the account of *St. Luke's* silence concerning it, and whom they chose to follow rather than *St. Matthew*, because he seems to be more clear for the enjoining this Prayer as a Form (in which notion they especially considered it) and because

e *Myſtagog. Ca-*
tech. 5.

f *Lib.* 3. c. 18.

g *Lib.* 7. c. 24.

h *Id.* *Greg.*

Not. & *Obſerv.*

ad l. ca. aliq. 8.

Scrip. c. 38.

h *In Mat.* 6.

Hom. 20.

because so far forth, and no farther, both the one and the other agreed in their accounts of it. Sure I am, there is little reason to believe, that that *Doxology*, whereof we speak, was by the favourers thereof foisted into *St. Matthew* from the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and the *Liturgies*, which is the only account besides that can be given of that variety, which is observ'd among the Ancients in this particular. For as we are not lightly to believe, that the Church would ever have allow'd such an insertion into the Gospel of *St. Matthew*, considering the reverend opinion she had of the sacredness thereof; so I see not, why, if it crept into *St. Matthew* out of the former Books, it should not in like manner have been foisted thence into the Gospel of *St. Luke*, which yet doth not appear to have been done. All things therefore considered, it must be said, that it was by means of *St. Luke's* silence concerning it, that the *Doxology* came to be omitted, and not upon any belief they had that it was, at the best, a *spurious* thing, and inserted, even where it is, without a competent Authority. And this I suppose too to have been the ground of that omission of it, which heretofore was and still in some measure continues in the *publick Monuments* of the Church of England, for though, till of late, there was no mention of it in the *Liturgy* of the Church, though it continues as yet excluded from some parts thereof, and hath not the least mention in that *Catholicism* I am now upon; Yet as it hath been of late inserted in some places of the *Liturgy*, yea mentioned in the same breath and tenour with the other parts of this most excellent Prayer; so it had always a place in the *English Gospels* of *St. Matthew*, which is a sufficient proof of her reverend opinion of it.

The *Doxology*, that is now before us, being thus established, and, if, I mistake not, sufficiently vindicated from the exceptions of the Adversaries thereof, we may the more cheerfully go on to the explication of it; In order whereunto, I will first consider it in its more simple and absolute intendment, and then with relation to those Petitions to which it is subjoin'd, and of which it is here alledged as a reason.

I. It is easy to observe, and therefore sufficient to mention it, that every Prayer is made up of two parts, *Petition* and *Praise*. The former of these is the business of all that goes before, and where we are taught to ask of him, to whom this Prayer is directed, whatsoever may conduce to Gods Glory, or our own welfare: It remains that as we pray to God, so we also give glory to him, which it is the design of this last clause to teach us. For though each of the foregoing Petitions is a tacit acknowledgment of Gods power and greatness, yet it is but a tacit one; and reason would that as we are explicit and clear in asking what we want, so we should be also in giving glory or praise unto him. Now that this is really the design of the words that are now before us in their more simple and absolute intendment, will need no other proof than their teaching us to ascribe to God those excellencies which are remembred by them. For if praise be nothing else than an acknowledgment of those excellencies which we choose to make the subject of it, if those words must consequently be look'd upon as a form of praise, which contain such an acknowledgment in them; then must these also be look'd upon as such, because containing such an acknowledgment of the excellencies of him to whom we pray, yea directing that acknowledgment to himself. Agreeable hereto is a passage

i 1 Chro. 29.
10, &c.

of the Prophet *David*, and which I do the more willingly produce, because it seems to me to have been the fountain of this particular *Doxology*, and will confer not a little toward the explication of it. For after this manner we are told *i* that that holy man *bleſſed* or *praiſed* the Lord, upon occasion of thoſe offerings which he and his people had made, for the Temple that was then providing for. *Bleſſed be thou Lord God of Iſrael, our Father for ever and ever. Thine O Lord is the greatneſs, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the Majeſty: for all that is, in the heaven, and in the earth is thine, thine is the Kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all, and in thine hand is power and might, and in thine hand it is to make great, and to give ſtrength to all.* Where we have not only the *bleſſing* or *praiſing* of God delivered under the ſame form, with that which is made uſe of here, but compoſed too of the mention of thoſe particular excellencies, which the *Doxology*, that is now before us, teacheth us to aſcribe to him. Thus therefore may thoſe words of our Saviour be paraphraſed in the general, and thus may every man conceive himſelf obliged to intend, when he ſaith, *for thine is the Kingdom, &c.* We have, O our Heavenly Father, beg'd ſuch bleſſings of thee, as we ſtand in need of, or as may make for the advancement of thy Name, and Kingdom, and Will. But we do not, O Lord, neither is it fit we ſhould, come unto thee only to beg, yea though they were ſuch things as make only for thine own glory. It is equally our deſire, what is but juſt for Creatures to do to their Creator, to acknowledge and depredicate thy excellencies, and particularly thy Kingdom, and Power, and Glory; Which though but an inconfiderable tribute, yet is a tribute which we owe thee, and indeed the only one we are in a capacity to pay. As for the more particular explication of this *Doxology*, it will depend upon the due underſtanding of thoſe excellencies which it commemorates, and which therefore I will now ſet my ſelf to give you.

To begin with that, which is the firſt in order, even the *Kingdom* of him whom we are here taught to praiſe, and by which we are undoubtedly to underſtand his *Sovereignty* and *Dominion*; That, as it is the moſt natural ſenſe of the word *Kingdom*, ſo being the ſenſe wherein it is uſ'd in that *Doxology* of *David*, from which I before ſaid this of our Saviour to have been borrowed. For *thou art exalted as head above all*, ſaid the forementioned *David* immediately after he had made mention of Gods *Kingdom*, as in the next verſe again *thou reignest over all*: Words which ſufficiently declare God's *Sovereignty* to be intended by it, yea that *Sovereignty* in particular which belongs to him as the Creator of the World, and muſt therefore be thought to be of as great extent, as that World, or the Creation is. And it is the rather to be noted here, becauſe the *Kingdom* of God is before taken in a more reſtrained ſenſe but which will not be found to come up to the largeneſs of that *Dominion*, which the words I am now upon prompt us to aſcribe to him. For beſide that that *Doxology*, from whence this appears to have been borrowed, impoſeth a more comprehensive one upon it; begging of God as we do, ſome bleſſings and benefits, which pertain rather to the adminiſtration of his more general Kingdom, than that which he manageth by the hands of the *Meſſiah* as ſuch, we muſt conſequently be thought to be oblig'd to make that the ſubject of our acknowledgments,

knowledgments, as well as the Kingdom of the Messiah. And we shall not therefore conceive amiss of this *first branch* of the present *Doxology*, if we draw both the one and the other Kingdom within the compass of it, and extend our thoughts and acknowledgments to them in this, or the like form. Thine, O God, is that Kingdom, by which the World, and the affairs thereof are managed, and thine too is that Kingdom, by which the Church, and the concerns thereof are governed. To thee therefore it appertains to dispose of all the events of the former, to conduct it by thy providence, and govern it by thy Laws. If other beings have a share of that Dominion, yet it is from thee that they receive it, and manage it by thy direction and appointment. To thee also it is, that the administration of that other Kingdom doth appertain, the Government of the Church, and of all that belongeth to it. To thee therefore it equally belongs to give Laws to the several subjects of it, to dispose of all its rewards and punishments, and of all those other things which tend to the accomplishment thereof. Which we do the more willingly acknowledge, that we may, together with it, make so much the more clear an acknowledgment of our subjection to thee, and dependance on thee, for the sake whereof it is that we thus become suppliants to thee.

To the mention of God's *Kingdom* subjoin we that of his *Power*, as without which a *Kingdom* is but of little consideration, and less repute. And surely so we shall have reason to do, if we follow the prescript of our Saviour here, or consider the immenseness of the power of God. For in *thine hand* (as the Prophet *David* speaks, and whose words will still serve us as an apt Comment on this part of Christ's) *in thine hand is power and might, and in thine hand it is to make great, and to give strength to all.* The Sea bears witness to this thy power, for it is thou that faist unto it, *hitherto shalt thou go, and no farther, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed,* which otherwise (as they sometime did, when thou brakest up the great deep) would turn again to cover the Earth. The madness of the people bears equal witness to this thy power, for thou stillest the raging of those men, as well as the noise of the other, which otherwise would make as great a confusion in the policy, and order of the World, as the other would in its piles and buildings. The unruly wills and affections of men bear witness to the same power, because changed by the vertue of it, into calm and gentle ones; and so also doth the weakness of much better disposed Souls, because by the same power made strong, and enabled to withstand the most violent temptations that can come against them. Which we do in like manner acknowledge to thee, as for other not contemptible reasons, so to give thee thereby a farther mark of our esteem.

It remains only that we add thereto, for thine is the *glory*, and which we shall find our selves to be under an equal obligation of acknowledging, whether we understand thereby whatsoever else deserves *glory and praise* (as how many other things are there in God, which are equally worthy of it, and which as such require of us the same honourable acknowledgments?) or whether we understand thereby (which is the most literal signification of it) *glory and praise it self.* For thine also is the *glory* in that more usual sense of it, it is but due to thee, and may be exacted by thee; I say not only for those works which thine own right hand effecteth, but for those either good, or powerful ones, which

are

are immediately wrought by the hands of men. If we obtain a Victory over our temporal Enemies, thine, O Lord, is the glory, for it is thou that *teachest our hands to war n, and our fingers to fight*; If we obtain a Victory over our lusts (those much more dreadful Enemies, because striking also at our better part) the glory of this also must be acknowledged to be thine, because effected by the power of thy grace and spirit. Whatsoever it is, or shall be, that merits glory, both that and the glory of it we acknowledge it to be thine, and that it shall *continue* to be such, as thy *Kingdom* and *power* in like manner shall; For thou art the same, neither shall any of thy excellencies fail; what thou art, and hast, thou shalt ever be, and enjoy. Which is the rather to be believ'd, because *he* hath taught us to say, that they should be his to *ages* or *for ever*, who was himself upon the *last age* of the present World, and who therefore, by affirming that they should abide *to ages* or *for ever*, intimated that they should enter into the other World, and where time and days shall be no more. The result of the premises is this, and thus may every man conceive himself obliged to intend, when he saith *thine is the Kingdom, &c.* Thou art a King, and shalt ever continue to be one; Thou art powerful, yea power it self, and shalt never cease to be so; Thou art all that is truly great and glorious, and shalt be so for ever, and shalt be acknowledged as such to eternal Ages.

Et. rē dū-
vas.

II. I have considered the present *Doxology* hitherto in its more *simple* and *absolute* intendment, and as it approves it self to be what the usual title thereof bespeaks it; I come now to consider it again in the *relation* wherein it here stands, and as a *reason* of all those Petitions, to which it is subjoin'd. For though the general design thereof be to give glory to God, and particularly as to those excellencies which are there commemorated; Yet as it appears by the Particle *on* (or *for*) wherewith it is introduc'd, that it was intended also as a reason of what it is subjoined to, so to attain a full understanding of it, we must consider it in that relation, and as a reason of those Petitions we are before taught to ask.

Now as he, who alledgeth any thing, as a reason of what he asks, must be supposed to do it first and chiefly, to induce him, of whom he asks it, to grant him the Petition he desires; so we shall find enough in this *Doxology* to induce him, to whom we pray, to accord us those Petitions which we ask. For it hath this in it, as a *Doxology*, that is is, as such, an acknowledgment of the divine excellencies, and which, as it is in it self an act well pleasing unto God, so will therefore be apt enough to dispose him to a favourable regard, and as favourable a consideration of our Petitions. This, I say, it hath in it, considered barely as a *Doxology*, and precluding from those particular excellencies, which it prompts us to acknowledge, and represent; How much more then, if there be also a particular persuasiveness in those excellencies, which a very superficial consideration of them will enable us to discover? For if that *Kingdom*, which we attribute to God, be really his, and consequently the disposal of all the blessings and benefits thereof; If he hath as much of *power* as he hath of Dominion, and so an ability to enstate us in those blessings and benefits, as well as sufficient Authority to confer them; Then must he also be in a capacity to answer our requests, and grant us those blessings which we ask. Which though in it self not sufficient to persuade the bestowing of them, because neither God nor

any

any other being acts to the extremity of its Authority and power, if they have not something beside that Authority and power to dispose them to the exerting of it, yet will it be found to be of no small force with such a being as is also *benign*, yea hath in it, as God is here affirmed to have, the benignity of a *Father*: Those beings, which are also benign, being likely enough to pleasure others, where they are in a capacity for it. Only as even a being, so qualified and dispos'd, may yet withhold its liberality where the things that are asked of it, do not equally tend to its own *honour* and *glory*; So our Saviour hath therefore taught us to press God farther with the tendency of these requests to *his*, and that we our selves do, and ever shall ascribe the granting thereof unto it. Which is certainly an inducement of all others the most powerful, especially with him, whose own honour and glory is, and always will be, the chief end of all his actions. For how should God deny a Petition, which tends to the promoting of that, which of all other things he most earnestly desires himself?

Of such force is the reason here alledg'd to induce him, to whom it is represented, to grant those Petitions which are ask'd upon it; And I no way doubt, because it is here made a part of our addresses to God, that it was our Saviours principal intention that we should look upon it as such, and accordingly represent it to him, as an inducement to the granting of them. But because he who was so kind as not only to teach us how to pray, but how to enforce our Prayers, may be presum'd to have been as willing to furnish us with Arguments to encourage our own hopes of the obtaining of them; And because we shall have yet more reason to believe so, yea to believe that to have been also his intention, if what he proposeth as a reason to induce God to grant our Petitions, will be equally a reason to us, to hope and expect the obtaining of them; Because, lastly, we are taught by him, who hath thus taught us to enforce our requests on God, to pray also with an assured expectation in our selves of obtaining those our requests of him; Therefore I think it not amiss, for the farther clearing of the *Doxology* now before us, to enquire as well, whether it be not a reason unto us to encourage our Faith, and hope, as to the obtaining of all those requests, to which it is subjoin'd. Which that it is, will soon appear, if we apply the particulars thereof to that Faith which we suppose it to establish. For there being but two things which are necessary to establish it, even the ability, and willingness of him, in whom we place it, to grant us those Petitions which we ask; If the particulars here mention'd assure us of each of these, they must consequently be thought to be an equal assurance of our Faith, and as such not unfitly represented to it. Now that so they do will need no other proof, than a consideration of the due importance of that *Kingdom*, and *power*, and *glory* which this *Doxology* prompts us to reflect upon. For if God hath the full disposal of all blessings and benefits, as his being *King* and Lord of all things doth sufficiently declare; if he hath a *power* no way inferiour to his Dominion and Authority, as this *Doxologies* so *unlimitedly* attributing *power* unto him doth equally perswade; Then must he be suppos'd to be in a capacity to pleasure us in all things, and his Kingdom and power so far forth a due establishment of our Faith and hope. If again the *glory* of those blessings we ask will undoubtedly reflect upon him, because proceeding from his alone bounty, and procured by his power; If we

our

our selves do as sincerely intend to ascribe the whole glory thereof to him, as the right he hath to it, and the purport of the present *Doxology* obligeth us to do; Then will there be as little doubt of God's granting us what we ask upon it, or of our not falling short of it: Because though he might deny *us*, yet he cannot deny *himself*, as he must be thought to do, if he neglect his own glory. With these particulars therefore, there is no doubt, we may encourage our own Faith and hope, as well as endeavour to awaken the benignity of the Almighty; With these particulars, for the reasons before mentioned, we may suppose it to have been the intention of our Saviour here, that we should actually encourage it, as well as attend to the stirring up of the other; And I am yet more confirmed in it, by this *Doxologies* being immediately subjoin'd to that Petition which prompts us to pray against the assaults of the Devil, and to which that *Doxology* hath been thought more especially to refer; The great power of that our adversary seeming to require some special encouragement to enable us to pray, with Faith, against him, as well as to withstand his assaults. Excellent to this purpose is that of *St. Chrysostome*, and which I do the rather alledge, to shew the belief of the *Greek Church*, that this *Doxology* was a part of our Saviours Prayer. Our Saviour, saith he p, *having made us sollicitous by the mention of the Enemy, and thereby cut off all slothfulness, he doth again embolden our minds by the mention of that King under whom we are plac'd, and that paramount power, which is invested in him. For thine, saith he, is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory. If therefore the Kingdom be his, we shall not need to fear any, there being none, who is able to oppose him, or to aspire to the same Empire. For when he saith, for thine is the Kingdom, he thereby sheweth, that that great adversary of ours is subject to him, though sometime, by the permission of God, he sets himself against him. For even he also is in the number of God's servants, though of such as are under disgrace and offenders, neither dares he set upon any of his fellow servants, till he hath first obtain'd power from above. Fellow servants did I say? Nay neither durst he enterprize any thing against the Swine until God and Christ gave leave, neither upon Jobs Flocks and Herds, till he had receiv'd power from above. Though therefore you were never so infirm in your self, yet you have reason to be confident, as having such a King over you, who can with ease effect all things by you. After so admirable a manner hath our Saviour taught us to praise God, as well as pray unto him, to enforce those Prayers of ours, and to encourage our own hopes of the obtaining of them; And having so done, he hath left us no pretence for withholding our Amen from it, which is the last word of this most excellent Prayer, and the only thing therefore farther considerable in it.*

AMEN.

from acknowledging, that, as the word *Amen* is a *seal* of the Lords Prayer, so it is a seal of our Lords own adding to it? Is it, that it is wanting in St. *Luke*, in some of the Latin Copies of St. *Matthew*, and in fine also not taken notice of in the *Comments* of several of the *Latin Fathers*? But what was said before in answer to this Objection, as to the foregoing *Doxology*, will be found to be alike applicable here. Is it then that the word *Amen* seems more proper for those who assist at the reciting of this Prayer, than for him who recites it himself? But we shall find by the *Psalms* that he himself thought otherwise of it, and that accordingly he made use of it. For as we find him in one place *g*, calling upon others to say *Amen* unto his Prayers, so we find him in other places *b* adding an *Amen* of his own to them, or rather a double one. There is not therefore, for ought that I can see, any just reason for the excluding of it, and we therefore to consider it as an addition of our Saviours, and accordingly to attend to the *Explication* of it.

II. In order whereunto we are to know, that as the word *Amen* in its primary signification, is as much as *truth* or *fidelity* i, and must therefore be thought to give the like sense to it in this secondary one; so we find it accordingly, in this latter one, rendered by *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodoret* E, *αληθως* or *μετ' αληθειαν*, yea so rendered even by the Writers of the New Testament: What is in the *Greek* of St. *Matthew* 1, and St. *Mark*, *Αληθως υμιν αμα* being by St. *Luke* m, where he records the same assertions, translated *αληθως λεγου υμιν*; conformably, as our Father n hath observ'd, to the receiv'd interpretation of it, and particularly to one we meet with in the *Septuagint* Version of the Prophet *Jeremy* o, where it is in like manner so translated. This therefore being the genuine signification of the word, and appearing so to be by allowed interpretations of it, we shall not be long to seek, what sense to impose upon it, where it is appl'd, as it is here, to a discourse. For thus much may be easily inferred from it, that it ought to be look'd upon first of all as a Declaration of our assent to, and allowance of that discourse, to which it shall be found to be appl'd: He who gives his *Amen* to it, because that is no other than *truth*, declaring thereby that he allows of it as such, and as it were sets his seal to it. But because the truths to be assented to may be of different sorts, and accordingly require of us different sorts of assent, and different Declarations of it; therefore, for the fuller understanding of that *Amen* which is to express them, we must consider it in the second place with relation to those truths, and accordingly adapt the signification thereof unto them. Now the truths whereof we speak, and by which therefore the signification of this *Amen* of ours is to be regulated, may be reduc'd to two heads, to wit, such as are pure and simple ones, or such as are also accompanied with goodness, and may therefore be the object of our affections, as well as of our assent. If question be made concerning pure and simple truths, such as are all those which are delivered by way of affirmation, or negation, so the *Amen* which is to be applied to them will betoken only our receiving them into our belief, because that is the only assent which they do require. And in this sense as the word *Amen* was taken by our Saviour in the places before remembered p, and must in like manner be taken when it is subjoined to the *Creed*, because that is the only assent which is proper to it. So it may not unfitly be rendered *so it is, hath been, or shall be* where the proposition is affirmative

five, or *so it is not, hath not been, or shall not*, where it is a negative one. On the other side, if question be made concerning such truths as are also attended with goodness, of which nature are all those which are delivered under the notion of *prayers* or *thanksgivings*; so beside our assent to them, as *true and legitimate ones*, and such as agree with those rules by which they ought to be framed, they will also require such affections of us as are suitable to that goodness, and a correspondent Declaration of them. By which means, if the truth whereof we speak be delivered under the notion of a *Prayer*, and which, as such, hath respect to some future good; so our *Amen* will betoken our making it the object of our desires, because that is the proper affection which a future good requires. Whence it is, that as the *Septuagint* do frequently translate it by *Amén*, and our *Catchism* here by *so be it*, both which are manifest Declarations of our desires; so the Prophet *Jeremy* explains that *Amen*, which he sometime gave to a desirable Prophecy, by *The Lord do so, and the Lord perform those words, which thou hast prophesied*. Again, if the truth whereof we speak be delivered under the notion of a *Thanksgiving*, and which, as such hath respect to some past good, and which we have been possessed of; so our *Amen* to it will betoken our grateful sense of that goodness, because that is the proper affection which such a goodness doth require. And in this sense as the word *Amen* is signally taken, where *St. Paul* demands, how if a man *gives thanks in an unknown tongue*, he that occupieth the room of the unlearned *can say Amen at it*: So it may not unfitly be rendered, *So it hath been with us, or so we have been obliged by thee*. The result of the premises is this: As that *Amen*, whereof we speak, is a Declaration of our assent to that whereunto it is appl'd, so it is the Declaration of such an assent as is suitable to the nature of it, and ought accordingly to be interpreted by us. And it will be found to have place thirdly, either where there hath not preceded any Declaration of our own, as in those Prayers which are uttered only by another, or where there hath, as in those which are repeated after him by our selves, or uttered only by our own selves, and in our own private retirements. If the former of these be the Case, so the ground of that our *Amen* will be the Declaration of our simple assent to that which is so said by another, and that we approve of, and join with him in it. But if the latter, a Declaration also of our doing it with a more than ordinary earnestness, and that what we so pray for, we do so with a peculiar fervour: There being no need of a simple Declaration of our assent where that hath been before declared. And in this sense as we are to understand those double *Amen*, which we find the *Psalmist* in the places before-quoted subjoining to his own Prayers, so we are to look upon that particular *Amen*, which is by the Doctrine of *St. Matthew*, to be subjoin'd to the present Prayer, because incumbent upon him, who saith the Prayer, as well as upon him, who listens to it; yea incumbent upon him, who is to pray apart by himself, and so cannot have any other to go before him in the rehearsal of it. Fourthly, as our *Amen*, especially when annex'd to a Prayer, may, together with a Declaration of our assent, betoken the doing of it with a more than ordinary fervour, so a belief also of our obtaining what we are so earnest in saying *Amen* to. Not that I think it receives any such force from the bare signification of the word; but from that intense desire which it implies, and the Fatherly tenderness of him to whom

9 Psa. 41. 13.

— 72. 19.

— 89. 52.

Jer. 28. 6.

1 Cor. 14. 16.

whom it is directed. For there being no desire at all of that which is not possible to be obtain'd, nor any intense desire of that which is not also probable; If our *Amen* imply such an intense desire (as our very subjoining it after the distinct rehearsal of the foregoing Petitions shews) it must consequently betoken a belief of our obtaining those blessings, the asking of which we do so say *Amen* to. Again, if that *Amen* of ours be founded in the paternity of him to whom it is directed (as, if it be a part of the present Prayer, it must necessarily be, because that paternity is plac'd in the front of it, to encourage the following Petitions of it) If that paternity be it, which puts us upon the subjoining of it, as well as upon those Petitions, to which it is so; neither can we, because the name of a *Father* is a name of the greatest tenderness, say an *Amen* to him, without expecting another from him, and so an assurance to us of those blessings we are taught to solicit by it. Lastly, if our *Amen* (especially as here considered) betoken also a belief of obtaining what we so say *Amen* to, if it betoken such a belief, upon the account of the paternity of him to whom it is directed; it will not only (as our *Catechism* instructs us) betoken a belief of our obtaining it by his mercy and goodness, but of obtaining it too, if it be also a Christian one, through our Lord *Jesus Christ*; because those promises, upon which our belief is founded, are by the Doctrine of Christianity to be performed by him, yea are *Tea* and *Amen* in him.

1 Cor. i. 20.

This therefore being the general nature of that *Amen* whereof we speak, and particularly of a Christian one, it will not be difficult for us to give an account of that particular one which is the close of the present Prayer. For so far as the general nature of an *Amen* will be found to be applicable to it, so far no doubt we ought to look upon it as an incumbent upon us to own, and apply it to all that, to which it is here subjoin'd. Now though it be not to be deny'd, because it is here subjoined to a Prayer, that we are principally to consider it in that notion, yet I cannot forbear to add, that we ought also to consider it in the other notions of it, and, first of all, as it hath a regard to *simple truths*, such as those are, which are expressed by simple affirmations or negations. For though there be little in the present Prayer, which is either expressly affirmed, or deny'd, and therefore as little so far, to which such an *Amen* can be apply'd; yet as there are many such affirmations and negations implied in it, and supposed by it, and to which therefore an implicit *Amen* must be supposed to be due from us; so there are some things, which are yet more clearly affirm'd, and to which therefore we cannot deny, but an explicit one is also due. Of the latter of these is *his being in Heaven*, to whom we are taught to address our selves, as in like manner that *his is the Kingdom, and power, and glory, yea shall be so for ever and ever*: Of the former, as many things almost, as there are words, or Petitions, and which therefore cannot but be thought to require a suitable *Amen* to them. For who sees not, that (though more covertly) yet it doth equally declare, that *he*, to whom we address our selves, is a *Father* and ours; that *he* hath a name, and Kingdom and will, that that name, and Kingdom, and will, is capable of being honoured by us, but yet, not without his direction and assistance? Who sees not, that it in like manner declares, that we depend upon him for our daily bread, yea for the forgiveness of our trespasses, but that we cannot expect the latter from him, without our own forgiving others? In fine, who sees not, that

it equally declares, that we cannot of our selves withstand the assault of temptations, that it is in his power, if he pleaseth, to lead us into them, yea suffer us to fall under them, and that he, and he alone can preserve, or deliver us from them? For as these, and other such like Declarations are clearly enough *impli'd*, and therefore an implicit assent but due from us to the truth of them; so they are, in truth, the foundation of those Petitions, which we are taught to make concerning them, and to which therefore if we assent not, we cannot, either with understanding, or sincerity, offer up those Petitions to the Almighty. The same is to be said in some measure concerning that other *Amen*, which hath a thanksgiving for its object; because that, though more covertly, hath a place in the present Prayer. For being taught by it to say, that that *Kingdom*, and *power*, and *glory*, which are mentioned in the close of it, do belong to that *God*, of whom the former Petitions are ask'd; Being consequently taught to acknowledge them, so far forth as they manifest themselves, and therefore also if they have done it by benign effects, by a grateful sense of them, and Declaration of it, that *Amen*, which we are taught to add unto the whole, must be supposed to extend to those, and denote as well the receipt of former favours, and our own sense of it, as our assenting to those Propositions, which it either expresseth, or implies, or the renewing of our requests for future benefits. Only as these last are the principal business of the present Prayer, and that *Amen* therefore, which we submit, to be in an especial manner applied to them; so if it be qualify'd, as is before described, it will become as effectual as that of *God*, who no sooner sayeth, *so be it*, but it becomes what he commands. For what doubt can there be of that, where it hath not only the Prayer of his own Son for its object; but is moreover attended with that *Prerogative*, which *qualifieth* it much, and that *Faith* which leaves nothing *unattainable* to either by it self, or us?

Gen. i. 3.

James 5. 16.

Mat. 21. 22.

FINIS.

EXPLICATION

CATECHISM

Dr. TOWERSON

ON THE

Sacraments.
